



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



141

A













THE  
AMERICAN  
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

EDITED BY  
BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,  
*Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University.*

---

VOL. IV.

---

BALTIMORE: THE EDITOR  
NEW YORK AND LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO.  
LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS  
1883

## No. 15.

I.—The New Revision of King James' Revision of the New Testament. III. By CHARLES SHORT, . . . . .	253
II.—On the English Dative-Nominative of the Personal Pronoun. By F. B. GUMMERE, . . . . .	283
III.—Participial Periphrases in Attic Prose. By W. J. ALEXANDER, . . . . .	291
IV.—Stichometry. II. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, . . . . .	309
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES: . . . . .	332
Henry Sweet: An Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse; An Anglo-Saxon Primer. Richard Morris: Specimens of Early English.—Eberhard Schrader: Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.—F. Mühlau and W. Volck: Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament.—George Bühler: Leitfaden für den Elementarcursus des Sanskrit mit Uebungsstücken und zwei Glossaren.—Edwin Wallace: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ.	
REPORTS: . . . . .	353
Rheinisches Museum.—Anglia.—Hermes.	
CORRESPONDENCE, . . . . .	375
RECENT PUBLICATIONS, . . . . .	380

## No. 16.

I.—The Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius. By HENRY NETTLESHIP, . . . . .	391
II.—On the Final Sentence in Greek. By B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, . . . . .	416
III.—T. L. Beddoes, a Survival in Style. I. By HENRY WOOD, . . . . .	445
IV.—NOTES: John Evelyn's Plan for the Improvement of the English Language. (H. E. Shepherd.)—Note on Mercator, v. 524. (Minton Warren.) . . . . .	456
V.—List of Irregular (Strong) Verbs in Béowulf. By J. A. HARRISON, . . . . .	462
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES: . . . . .	478
Quest's History of English Rhythms.—Gartner's Raetoromanische Grammatik.—Mather's Aeschylus. Prometheus Bound.—Wölfflin's Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik.—Dunbar's Concordance to Aristophanes.—Ulrich's Bifrun's Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments.—Engelbrecht's Studia Terentiana.—Foerster's Altfranzösische Bibliothek.—Ribbeck's Emendationum Mercatoris Plautinae Spiellegium.	
REPORTS: . . . . .	503
Englische Studien—Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft—Journal Asiatique—Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale—Romania—Schuchardt's Kreolische Studien.	
RECENT PUBLICATIONS, . . . . .	519

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

---

VOL. IV, 1.

WHOLE No. 13.

---

## I.—THE COLOR-SYSTEM OF VERGIL.<sup>1</sup>

Charles Lamb used to say of himself that '*darkness was his hell*.' In the genius of this man there is a flavor of bright and sparkling childhood; and in making hell consist of darkness, he uttered a feeling that is common both to all children and to all nations in the childlike stage of their growth. Thus our *hell* itself, the Old Norse *hel*, the Gothic *halja*, is probably from the same root as the Greek *κελαινός* (black), personified as *Κήρ*, the goddess of death. So, in the very foundations of Indo-germanic speech, darkness is one with death; light is at once the essence and the symbol of physical life.

This childlike identification of *darkness* with *hell* came up, as we saw in Charles Lamb's case, from the first impressions of his childhood into the ripeness of the sensitive, thoughtful man. So, with the Greeks, the conception of darkness as the awfulness of death, the conception of life as the clear effulgence of light, lasted over, as an abiding element of their imagination, from primitive days into the consummate perfection of their poetry. In Euripides, for example, the dying Alkestis, as she feels the approach of death, cries out:

σκοτία δ' ἐπ' ὅσσοις νύξ ἐφέρει (269).

As she prays for long life for the children that she is leaving, it is:

χαίροντες, ὦ τέκνα, τόδε φάος ὀρῶτον (272).

As her women pray for her parting soul, her death is for them:

τὸν ἀνάλιον οἶκον οἰκετεύειν (437);

<sup>1</sup> This paper was prepared for the Philological Association of the Johns Hopkins University, and read before that body on the 14th of April, 1882.

and the last farewell of the dying woman, as she goes down, willing but awe-stricken, into the Valley of the Shadow, is

*Ἄλιν καὶ φάος ἡμέρας.*

So too, in Sophokles, the last words of Ajax, before he falls upon his sword, are

*σὲ δ' ὃ φαεινῆς ἡμέρας τὸ νῦν σέλας  
καὶ τὸν διφρευτὴν Ἥλιον προσεννέπω (856).*

Thus, here and in countless other passages of like feeling, there comes out a law of the Greek mind, a fundamental fact of the Greek imagination at work: darkness is for the Greek the physical sign and expression of death; sunlight, in its white glow, in its shining, uncolored radiance, is the physical sign, the essence and expression of life.

In passing, however, from the poetic atmosphere of the Greeks into the Italians', there is a further progress to be marked in this conception of light as the essence, the metonym of life. See, for example, how the great Italian poet describes the growing horror of the scenes through which Aeneas went down from the sunlit life of man into the regions of the dead—

*rebus nox abstulit atra colorem (Aen. VI 272).*

Here it is no longer mere light, it is color that emerges as the sign of life; and it is the loss of color that is the sign of death. To the eyes, to the minds, to the imaginations of the Greeks, the pure light of the sun, falling in undissolved whiteness, piercing, penetrating, almost blinding in its sharp etching of shadow and illumination, had been the glory of the physical universe, the charm of life, the symbol of all intelligence, the speech, as it were, and the revelation of the Godhead itself. Form, sharply defined in the black and white of the uncolored sunlight, was for Greek imaginations the type of the highest beauty. But the imagination of the Italians comes out in their best poetry as something less plastic than the Greeks', and more sensuous: light pours through the gorgeous realms of their poetic world, no longer white and undissolved, but broken into prismatic splendors of innumerable tints, reflected and refracted into all combinations of pure and of blended colors. Form is no longer so all-sufficing, so correct, so sharply defined as in the black and white, the lights and shadows, of the Greek ideals. But form illumined by colored lights, form losing the sharpness of its outlines in the tender vagueness of colors that melt and blend

with one another, such is the highest beauty of the world as the world was seen by Italian eyes and painted by Italian poets.

Such was the Italian, such above all was Vergil's conception of the part that color, as distinguished from pure light, plays in the beauty of the universe. For him it was color that made the glory of life; it was the withdrawing of color that made the dreadfulness of the dead man's world. For him, however, this separation of color from light, this glorification of color at the expense of light, was accomplished only by the stress of a grand imagination. But for us, strange to say, we can find in the resources of modern chemistry the means of changing Vergil's imagination into scientific fact; we can separate light from color, and light up a dismal world of horrors from which all color is banished. We can see before us in the laboratory the very scene that Vergil makes Aeneas behold as he goes down alive in Hell. The process and the result of this wonderful experiment are well described in Rood's *Modern Chromatics*, pp. 102-3.

From the witnessing of such an experiment we shall come forth persuaded for ever of the fundamental truth of Vergil's conception: the glory of the physical universe consists, above all, in the diffusion of color; and the poetic conception and the presentation of life before the sensuous imagination are to be attained in their highest effects only by the management and utilization of color.

Among the great poets of Italy, the poets that saw and lived in color rather than in pure light the chief beauty of the universe, Vergil is the greatest. He made, as I shall show you, a prodigious use of color in his own compositions. He used a rich variety of color-terms with a delicate precision of meaning; and by his example he fixed the use of color-terms and defined the range of color-impressions for the poetic literature of his race. I wish, therefore, so far as I can, to lay before you the color-system of this great master of poetry. I wish to explain the color-terms that he uses, and to arrange and analyze the color-impression that he aims to create. In conclusion, by comparing the results thus obtained from Vergil with the results obtained by other scholars from Homer, I wish to show how far Vergil had advanced beyond Homer, both in his appreciation of color and in his precision of expression for color. By such a comparison, it seems to me that we shall reach a fair measure of the progress made by civilized mankind, within that thousand years, in the adaptation of human language to the color-sensations of the eye.



The first chromatic impression that the mind gets from reading Vergil is the impression of his delicate and loving perception of color, and of the splendid richness and variety of his color-effects. All through his poems, as well the poems of his sensuous youth as the poems of his sobered maturity, whether he is dealing with external nature or with human life, his verses are aglow with an iridescent radiance of color. Sometimes it is still-life, a flower or a fruit or a vegetable, pictured with delicate fidelity to nature's coloring. Sometimes it is a living animal, bird or snake, gorgeous with bright plumage or with lustrous scales. Sometimes it is the human figure itself, maiden or warrior, luminous with richness of flesh-tints or splendid in garments of many colors. Sometimes it is a landscape, or a sky-effect, cool with the green light of the forest or glowing with all the radiance of the sunset. Turn where you will, there is always color imprisoned in the sonorous beauty of the verse, until the gem-like Vergilian phrases seem to be alive inside with as many shifting hues as the beryl-stone of the poet. In the *Aeneid*, for example, 8, 22, he tells us how, in a basin fed from the brass lips of a fountain, the yellow light, flashing from the brass, is reflected from the water and sent flying in tremulous patches amid the carved work of the ceiling. In the second *Eclogue*, v. 50, the white-armed Naïd lights up the heaps of dark blue-berries with yellow clusters of marigolds. In the *Copa*, v. 20, there is the grouping of wreaths of yellow weld with purple roses, and brown chesnuts side by side with red-cheeked apples, and blood-red mulberries piled up with purple grapes and blue egg-plants. In one exquisite poem of the *Catalecta*, VI 10, there stands like a delicate vision of antique beauty the statue of Amor carved in white marble with wings of many-colored feathers. Rising from still-life to human life, he brings before us Aeneas himself (IV 261): his sword was starred over with tawny jasper, and the cloak that hung from his shoulders blazed with Tyrian purple, and the threads of the purple were held apart by slender threads of gold. So Chloereus (XI 771) shone with red and purple, and a gold bow hung from his shoulder, and his cloak was saffron-dyed and his leggings were embroidered with many colors. And in landscape, as he paints the site of Venice before Venice arose, his picture seems to glow with all the deep splendors of the Venetian painters: the Po through fat fields pours its yellow waters into a purple sea, *Georg.* 4, 372. And again, with what soft tenderness of color he pictures the fountain flowing from the dark mouth of the grotto: here there reigned the pinkness of

spring; here the earth brought forth her flowers, and a white poplar hung over the mouth of the cavern, Ecl. 9, 40. And, in another place, as the boats full of armed men glide along the forest-river, the green woods gaze with amazement upon the shining shields of warriors and upon the brightly painted boats gleaming back reflected from the quiet waters, VIII 92. And at sunrise, the sea grows red beneath the level rays, and the yellow Dawn rides up the sky in her rosy chariot, VII 25. Oftenest, however, of all he comes back to the richest of all color-effects, to the rainbow, *mille coloribus arcum*, V 609. Art and science meet in the memorable description of Iris, flying dew-bespangled across the sky on saffron-colored wings, and drawing after her, as she faces the sun, a trail of a thousand colors, IV 700-1. Thus, in small things as in great, the visions of physical life and of ideal beauty that floated in the imagination of Vergil were visions as splendid in color, as thoroughly Italian in sensuous color-effects, as ever came in after-centuries to fix themselves upon the canvases of a Giorgione or a Veronese or a Titian.

At this point it will be well for us, before we go further, to settle in our minds the conception that lay for the ancient mind in the word *color*. For, in our modern speech, half unconsciously, we gather in from the results of science the scientific conception of things and the scientific meaning of words. But, if we deceive ourselves into applying to ancient words our modern scientific conceptions, we misunderstand the thinking of antiquity and bring confusion and disorder into all their poetry. For us moderns, under the teaching of Young and of Helmholtz, color is a subjective sensation produced upon three sets of nerves within the eye by three kinds of waves that differ in their length. When the longest wave strikes upon the nerves that are fitted to receive its impression, we see red; when the shortest wave strikes upon its nerves, we see violet; when waves of the intermediate length strike upon their nerves, we see green. And when waves of different lengths fall upon our eyes commingled, we see colors such as yellows, blues, purples, etc., made up of violet, green and red. A nobler theory was never devised by the wit of man to explain the phenomena of nature: the theory, for my part, takes already its place in discovered truth as a sublime law of nature, most exquisite in its adaptation of wave to nerve. We must, indeed, keep this theory to explain the facts of color as they arise in the world; but in dealing with the color-terms of ancient languages and in reconstructing the

color-system of ancient poets we must lay this theory aside and force ourselves back into the childlike conceptions that arose in the childhood of mankind. The noun *color* goes back to the root *cal*, I. G. *skal* or *skar*, meaning to cover, to conceal. It is akin to the verb *celare* (hide) and *occudere* (cover). "Die Sprache," says Prof. Curtius, p. 111, "fasst die Farbe als Decke auf." Color in the conception of Indo-germanic language is the cover of things. So in Greek, *χρῶμα* (*color*) is from the same root as *χρῖς* (*skin*). In the I. G. languages, the color of a thing is the cover or skin that overlies or hides the true substance. From this conception, however false it may be in science, we have to make our start in explaining the color-terms of ancient poetry. If we apply it to Vergil, we shall find the term *color* used in several different senses. In its widest sense, Vergil uses *color* to denote the colored skin or cover that overlies all visible objects, *e. g.*

*rebus nox abstulit atra colorem* (VI 272).

Here *color* is a kind of skin that may be, as it were, peeled off. By metaphor drawn from this use, *color* denotes the surface as opposed to the substance, the appearance as opposed to the reality of things, *e. g.*

*nimum ne crede colori* (Ecl. II 17).

Next, by a natural transition, *color* denotes the dye-stuff used to give color to a foreign substance:

*varios discet mentiri lana colores* (Ecl. IV 42).

Then it may denote the dark spots lying on the surface of a bright body; so of the sun he says:

*ipius in vultu varios errare colores* (Georg. I 452).

Then *color* is narrowed down to denote the warm colors, reds, browns, etc., even when darkened almost to black. So in speaking of color as test of the soil's fertility, he says:

*promptum est praediscere, quis cui color* (Gg. II 256)

*... ab Indis* (Gg. 4, 203), (brown races, colored people).

And of the purple grape:

*... in celis* (Ecl. IX 40).

Then *color* denotes the same warm colors illuminated toward white. Of the woodpecker:

*... color* (Aen. VII 101).

And, by a special narrowing, *color* denotes the exquisite tints of red and white, rose and lily commingled, that make the complexion of a beautiful girl :

Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro  
Si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa  
Alba rosa : *tales virgo dabat ore colores* (Aen. XII 67).

Finally, by a still further mingling of white, *color* comes to denote the palest yellow, almost white itself ; so he says of horses

color deterrimus albis | et gilvo (Gg. III 82).

Vergil, you will remember, in speaking of the rainbow, called it *mille coloribus arcam*. Only by a bold guess, of course, by the lucky divination of genius, could he have given as one thousand the number of distinct colors in the solar spectrum. Yet, strange to say, Aubert has proved by his famous experiments and calculations (cf. Rood, p. 40), that in the solar spectrum, as spread out by artificial means in the laboratory or by natural means in the gorgeousness of the perfect rainbow, the unaided human eye can see and distinguish 1000 different colors. In addition, however, we must bear in mind that one of the colors commonest both in art and in nature, the purple, is not seen at all in the solar spectrum. Hence, in order to get the number of distinct colors that the eye can see in nature, to the 1000 hues of the perfect spectrum we must add on about 100 more for the full and the graded hues of purple. Let us assume, then, that, in nature seen under ordinary daylight, there are for the healthy human eye about 1100 distinguishable colors. By different degrees of white illumination, this number, as Aubert proves, can easily be carried up to 100,000 tints ; and by illuminating the spectrum by colored light, red, green, violet, etc., the number of tints passes up into incalculable millions, into a mathematical infinity of possible colors. But let us keep to the 1100 colors as the norm for practical work.

Given, then, these 1100 colors that can be seen and known by the human eye, it is the task of human speech to furnish expression more or less adequate for this number of color-sensations. The power of the various languages to do this, a power that varies from the rude inadequacy of barbarous dialects up to the subtle discriminations and overflowing wealth of the most perfect languages, is no bad measure of the perfection of language for the expression of human needs. In English, for example, I find that Roget has given the number at 102. The power of the modern French,

however, in the apt and clear expression of color, is recognized by philologists as one of the most marvellous facts of that marvellously rich and picturesque language, and is perhaps the highest perfection of color-expression ever attained by human speech. The number of color-terms in common use in modern French is said to be not much short of 500. How, now, does the Latin of Vergil stand in this comparison? Over what number of color-terms does the genius of the poet bear sway, in order to find linguistic expression for the beauties of color that he discovered in nature? How many, as it were, and what are the pigments that lie upon the palette of this exquisite painter of the world for the rendering of all his color impressions? A friend of Alma Tadema (Collier, *Primer of Art*, p. 55) has lately told us that this exquisite master of color reproduces his color-impressions of the antique world by a palette of 12 colors. As compared with this dozen real pigments of Alma Tadema, the palette of Vergil's vocabulary contains 27 terms of high color—rather more than twice as many. But, as I shall prove hereafter, the defects of his language compel Vergil to use for the expression of definite color many terms for white and black and gray, terms which in their scientific sense are not color-terms at all, but which in their poetic use are often the expression of real and powerful color, as seen under excess and deficiency of illumination. Of such terms for black, white and gray, there are 15 in Vergil's vocabulary; and if these 15 be added to the 27 terms of pure color, we have 42 pigments in the color-system of the Vergilian poetry. Compare now this number of 42 color-terms with the number, fixed above, of 1100 colors to be expressed by them. From the bare statement of this rough numerical relation, 42 to 1100, there follows one consequence of prime importance for the understanding of Vergil's color-system. Each color-term of the 42 must cover, on the average, the expression of 26 closely allied tints. For each color-term, therefore, we must seek to find one precise color, as the norm, and, as it were, the center or axis of its chromatic power. This, if fixed by the color of some object in physical nature, unchanged and unchangeable, will serve us as the natural or physical standard of that particular color-term. For *sanguineus*, e. g. we shall have *sanguis*. But on both sides of that physical standard we must expect to find a group of allied tints, expressed, indeed, by the same color-term, but grading off tint by tint, up and down the vertical spectrum, toward the color-terms that lie nearest. In *caeruleus*, for example, there must lie not only the

meaning of pure blue, as found in *caelum*, but also on both sides of blue a large number of distinct tints, closely allied to blue, but grading off, tint by tint, on the upper side toward green, and on the lower side toward violet. Here is the natural infirmity of language; no language, however rich, however precise, can ever be so developed as to cover the absolute infinitude of man's perceptions and sensations. Every human soul in its efforts at utterance is doomed to everlasting failure; the finite expression cannot be so stretched as to cover the infinite realities of things.

In understanding Vergil's poetry, therefore, we are forced to give to each color-term that he uses a somewhat widened range of tint-variation. Bearing this in mind, let us now arrange the color-terms of Vergil in their allied groups, according to proximity of tint in the spectrum of nature.

Following the theory of Helmholtz, a theory that I accept as a demonstration, I shall give first the three primary groups of red, green and violet; then the group that lies between red and green; then the group that lies between green and violet; lastly, the tints of so-called purples and blacks and grays and whites that, although occurring in nature, do not occur within the spectrum itself. But, in giving this catalogue of Vergil's color-terms, I wish to do more than simply to mark the existence of each particular color in Vergil's great picture of the universe. I wish to give a quantitative estimate of Vergil's use of the different colors. If we can fix the number of times that Vergil makes use of each color, we shall be able to discover his color-preferences, and to find out how far the color-sense of Vergil corresponds with the diffusion of color in nature; that is, how far the poetic presentation agrees with the realities of things. The color-sense of every great artist is an important element of his genius, a strongly marked characteristic of his artistic manner and range of perception. In painting, for example, it is obvious to all that love the art, to all that have striven to understand the work of any great man, that to the eye and to the taste of every original painter certain groups and ranges of color are distinctly preferable to certain others. These preferences and partialities are so strongly marked in each man's works as to be a striking characteristic of his genius. Amid the vast infinities of nature's coloring, no single eye is capable of finding equal joy in all the colors that make up the color-effects of the universe; no genius for coloring is so vast and so catholic as to be able to take in and reproduce in an equable manner all the coloring of nature. Hence, to use familiar examples,

the splendid genius of Turner and the calmer, truer genius of Ruisdael are almost complementary to each other in the preference shown for the warm colors and for the cool colors of the spectrum, for the sunset glories and for the forest-tinted greens of the landscape. The sombre, brownish magnificence of Piloty's *Death of Wallenstein* differs as much from the glowing splendors of Paul Veronese's banqueting-scenes as if the two painters had looked out on different worlds of color.

As it is in painting, so it is in poetry. To each poet's eyes the world puts on a different aspect. Each poet, if we watch him at his work of representing nature as he sees it, will show a preference for certain ranges of color and a distaste for certain others. Thus, in studying the color-system of Vergil by its quantitative use of color-terms, we shall be able, in a general way, to see with his eyes the aspect of the physical universe, to learn his likes and his dislikes in color-effects, and to understand how far his genius conforms to the realities of nature in the diffusion and prevalence of color as an element of beauty.

I. Red group of color-terms.—*Ruber*, used 36 times; *rutilus*, 5; *sanguineus*, 14; *cruentus*, 2; *sandix*, 1; *minium*, 2; *ferrugo*, 5; *roseus*, 12. Total of red group 77.

II. Green group of color-terms.—*Viridis*, used 63 times; *vitreus*, 1; *hyalus*, 1. Total of green group 65.

III. Violet group of color-terms.—None used with exclusive and absolute precision of tint.

IV. Group of color-terms between red and green.—*Igneus* used 1; *spadix*, 1; *fulvus*, 20; *flavus*, 19; *croceus*, 16; *luteus*, 5; *um*, 33; *gilvus*, 1; *cereus*, 1. Total of red-green group 97.

V. Group of color-terms between green and violet.—*Pallidus* 24 times; *lividus*, 2; *caeruleus*, 31. Total group of green-violet color-terms 57.

VI. Outside group of color-terms not belonging in spectrum, formed by composition. *Purpureus* used 33 times, *puniceus* 7, *um* 11, *murex* 3; red and blue 54. *Albus* 38, *candidus* 37, *us* 18, *decolor* 1, *argenteus* 2, *lacteus* 5, *marmoreus* 6; formed by blending, more or less perfect, of complementary colors 107. *us* 13, *glaucus* 9, *ater* 72, *fuscus* 4, *fumeus* 1, *niger* 41, *pullus* 1, *us* 2; formed by the darkening, more or less complete, of each or 143.

Thus, in Vergil, if we include the so-called blacks, whites and greys, there are 600 uses of color-effect; but, if we leave out the



blacks, whites and grays, there are 350 uses of bright color in the poems.

Later on we shall compare this diffusion of the different colors in Vergil's poetry with the actual diffusion of the same colors in the physical universe, and work out some interesting results. But, before this comparison can be made, we must find out some philological system, some method of hermeneutics, by which we can fix more precisely the color-significance of each color-term itself.

The color of anything in nature, whose color is visible to the human eye in any given position, depends on at least three elements that are always present, the three so-called *constants of color*, cf. Rood, ch. III, and pp. 209-10. Think, for example, of a mass of green leaves hanging as foliage upon a tree. The color of that foliage will depend

1st, on the wave-length of the waves of light reflected from those leaves into your eyes. That is *hue*, absolute color, as element in color-perception.

2d, on the amount of green light that is reflected from the leaves into your eyes. That is the *brightness* or *luminosity* of the color as an element in the color-impression.

3d, on the amount of white light that is mingled with the green light in the final color-impression. This is the *purity* of the color. If all white light could be removed, a thing impossible to do, the color would be absolutely pure; as the amount of white light is increased, the purity becomes less and less. At last, by excess of white light, all color may be made to vanish into whiteness.

From the clear understanding of these three elements of color, you will see that there can be no objective fixedness in our color-impression of any visible object. The hue may abide the same, but accidental variations in purity or in luminosity may make the color-impression vary in ever-shifting tints from what approaches blackness up to what approaches whiteness. As the distance varies, as the laws of aerial perspective work their will upon objects more near or more remote, dark objects become lighter when afar off, light objects become more vivid when near by. Now the color-terms of the poet, like the pigments of the painter, are not meant to define the absolute color of things; the mere wave-lengths of the waves of light that each thing reflects are not to be defined in the language of art. The poet like the painter records not what the thing is in itself, but what the thing seems to be in his eyes under all the circumstances that surround it. From this it comes to pass that



objects which seem to us altogether different in color are often presented by the poet under the same color-term. Thus, under process of darkening, from defect of luminosity, the green of the fresh-cut foliage and the red of flowing blood are both called by Vergil *ater*, *ater sanguis*, Gg. III 507, and *frondibus atris*, Aen. VI 215. And again, under variations of purity, by contrast with different surrounding colors, the color of the same object may be expressed by two different color-terms. For example, in the same book of the Aeneid, V 309 and 494, the foliage of the olive is at one time *viridis*, at another *fulva*. Unless you can make plain to your minds the variations in our color-perceptions that are produced by variations in luminosity and purity, above all the variations produced by contrast, you can never hope to understand the use of coloring in painting nor of color-terms in poetry. Who, for example, that has seen the blue-green waves of the ocean blanch into whiteness under the red light of the setting or the rising sun can fail to understand why Vergil calls the sea *marmoreum aequor*? The poet's eyes saw in nature and painted in language the exact effect which is produced in the laboratory by throwing red light on a blue-green surface, Rood, p. 153.

From the point that we have reached we can come back to the practical problem that color-terms present to the mind of the philologist. If color be a thing so variable and so unfixed, by what means known to philology are we to fix the meaning, and to understand the use, in any ancient writer, say in Vergil, of the color-terms that he employs? Upon this problem as it arises in Greek philology, the minds of many Greek philologists have been of late keenly directed. But in their investigations, full of learning and full of charm as they are, it seems to me that there have been such grave mistakes of method as to rob their conclusions of permanent and solid value. I am not without hope, therefore, that by examining the color-system of a single great poet, especially of one so fond of color and so versed in color as Vergil, we may be able to learn some facts, perhaps even to establish some laws of interpretation, that may be of use in defining the color-terms of other ancient writers and of other ancient languages above all, where we need it most, in the Greek. My own conclusion is that, in order to understand the meaning of any given color-term, we must work up to our final result by five successive stages of methodical investigation.

1st. The etymology of the color term must be studied. If we

can trace the word backward to its root and discover and compare its cognates, we shall find the fundamental conception, the concrete significance, that underlies its use, *e. g.* the derivation of *gilvus* from the I. G. root *gar* (shine, bright) and its connection with *bilis* in Latin, with *γελεῖν* (= *λάμπειν*, *ἀνθεῖν* Hesych.) and figuratively *γελᾶν* in Greek, with *yellow* in English, are full of help.

2d. The physical standard of the color must be fixed. We must try to find in nature some fixed and permanent standard of the color-term in question, some visible object that may fix the color for our eyes, and make us able to visualize, as it were, the color-impression of the ancient poet, *e. g.* the splendid pure red of *sandix* is fixed for ever in the mind of one that has ever looked upon the mineral (*realgar*, red sulphuret of arsenic) in which it occurs.

3d. The extension of the given color up and down the gamut of the spectrum must be determined, *e. g.* *caeruleus* running up almost to green and running down almost to violet.

4th. The variation of the color under different degrees of purity and luminosity must be determined, *e. g.* *purpureus* may lighten up into the softest shades of pink, or darken until it loses itself in a kind of violet blackness.

5th. The variation of each color by contrast, in combination with other colors, must be studied; and it will explain the most violent use of the color-terms, *e. g.* a wreath of olive leaves around a head of black or brown hair will seem yellowish and be called *fulvus*; but around a head of yellow hair will seem intensely green and be called *viridis*.

In separate essays, I hope to publish, so far as Vergil is concerned, my determination of his various color-terms according to this five-fold method of investigation. For the present I cannot do more than give in the fewest words the etymology and physical standard of each term.

*Ruber.* I. G. *rudh*, name of blood and of planet Mars, cognate with *ἐρυθρός*, *red*, *ruddy*, etc. Physical standard, the color of the crab when cooked, *rubentes ure foco caneros*. Gg. 4, 47.

*Rutilus.* I. G. *rudh*, akin to *ruber*, with red verging toward yellow. Physical standard, the splendid color of the Italian bee, *rutilus clarus squamis*. Gg. 4, 93.

*Sanguineus*, from *sanguis*. I. G. *sag* (drop, flow), cf. Latin *sucus*. Physical standard, color of fresh blood dropping from wound, blood itself, mulberry.

*Cruentus*, from *cruor*. I. G. *kru* (hard), cf. *crudelis*, κρίος, κρύσταλλος, etc., Eng. *raw*. Physical standard, *cruor*, blood hardening and darkening after it has left the body. Myrtle-berries show very dark red, *cruenta myrta*. Gg. 1, 306.

*Sandix*, Gr. σάνδυξ. Etymology unknown to me. Physical standard, *realgar*, red sulphuret of arsenic, used as dye-stuff. Ecl. 4, 45.

*Minium*. Etymology unknown to me. It is said to be an Iberian word. Physical standard, cinnabar, vermilion, used as rouge. Ecl. 10, 27.

*Ferrugo*, iron rust, from *ferrum*. Physical standard fixed in nature. The color of the larkspur, dark red, rather dull, *ferrugineus hyacinthus*. Gg. 4, 183.

*Roseus*, from *rosa*, probably of Semitic origin. Physical standard, rose-red with blue tinge, light or dark, red lips of beautiful women. Aen. 9, 5, etc.

*I'iridis*. I. G. *ghvar*, *ghar* (sprout, grow). Physical standard, young leaves of trees, young grasses.

*I'itreus*, from *vitrum* (glass). I. G. *rid* (to see). Physical standard, greenish antique glass, of transparent green, *vitrea Fucinus nuda*. Aen. 7, 759.

*Hyalus*, Gr. ἵαλος (raindrop, glass). I. G. *su* (drop). Physical standard, glass of deep green color, *hyali saturo fucata colore*. Gg. 4, 335.

*Igneus*, from *ignis*. I. G. *ag* (move, flicker). Physical standard, fiery red of sun presaging wind-storm, (Sol' *igneus Euros*. Gg. 1, 453.

*Spadix*, Gr. σπάδιξ, date-palm, name from Semitic. Physical standard, date, rich red brown, used of bay horse, *honesti spadices*. Gg. 3, 82.

*Flavus*, root *ghar* (grow, sprout), cf. *viridis*. Physical standard, ripening grain, Tiber at Rome, according to Fronto's definition made up of green and red raised by white, *radiatim flavesceat campus arista*. Ecl. 4, 28.

*Favus*, root *ghar* (grow, sprout), cf. *viridis* and *flavus*. Physical standard, skin of lion, plumes of eagle, according to Fronto's definition, the same as *flavus*, with white left out, *favus Jovis ales*. Aen. 12, 247.

*Crocus*, from *crocus* (saffron), Semitic word. Physical standard, saffron itself, used as dye stuff, yellow tinged with red, *crocumque radentem*. Gg. 4, 182.

*Luteus*, from *lutum* (weld). Root *lu* for *hlu* for *ghlu* for *ghar* (sprout). Physical standard, weld itself, used as dye-stuff, yellow with less red than *croceus*, e. g. *Aurora lutea in roseis bigis*. Aen. 7, 26. Yellow seems more yellow seen against red.

*Aurum* (gold). Root *aur* = *aus* = *vas* (burn, blaze), cf. *Aurora*, etc. Physical standard, gold itself, yellow with lustre, becoming reddish by reflection, *sol aureus*. Gg. 1, 232.

*Cereus*, from *cera*. I. G. *kar* (to separate), *κηρίς*. Physical standard, wax, yellow plum.

*Pallidus*. Root *pal* (greenish-blue, or bluish-green darkened). Germ. *fahl*. Physical standard, brunette complexion after death or in violent fright, *Dido pallida morte futura*. Aen. 4, 644.

*Lividus*. Root *liv* (gray-blue). Physical standard, *lead, glandes viventis plumbi*. Aen. 7, 687.

*Caeruleus*, from *caelum*. I. G. *kav* (hollow, vault). Physical standard, blue sky, normal tint of Mediterranean, *caeruleo sunt nomina ponto*. Aen. 12, 182.

*Purpureus, purpura*, Gr. *πορφύρα*. I. G. *bhar* (wave, agitate). Physical standard, murex, or sea-snail, magnificent color formed by union of red and blue, ripe grape, *purpureae vites*. Gg. 2, 95.

*Puniceus*, from *Punicus*, from *Poenus*, origin of the color from Carthage or Phoenicia. Physical standard, murex itself. It seems to have more red than *purpureus*, *puniceis rosetis*. Ecl. 5, 17.

*Murex*. I. G. *mar, smar* (rub, stain, smear), name given to the dye made from sea-snail. Physical standard, itself, as dye-stuff, *Tyrio ardebat murice laena*. Aen. 4, 262.

*Ostrum*. Gr. *ὄστρεον*, oyster, shell-fish. I. G. *as* (cast off, throw away). Physical standard, same as above, inclining strongly to red, *ebur violare sanguineo ostro*. Aen. 12, 67.

*Albus*. I. G. *albh* (white, dull white, approached either through yellow or through blue), cf. *ἄλφι, ἄλφος*, etc. Physical standard, white, or albumen, of egg, blue-white. Sulphur, yellow-white, *sulfurea Nar albus aqua*. Aen. 7, 517.

*Candidus*. I. G. *kand, skand* (shine, glow with heat), cf. *incendere, κάρδαρος* (live coal). Physical standard, lily glowing white against dark green leaves, white horse in sunshine, feeding in field of grass, etc., *candida viridi in litore conspicitor sus*. Aen. 8, 83 (*fetu albo*).

*Niveus*, from *nix*. I. G. *snig* (wash, cleanse). Physical standard, *nix*, generally a cold, bluish white, but changing with atmospheric conditions.

*Argenteus*, from *argentum*. I. G. *arg* (shine, glitter), cf. ἀργός. Physical standard, silver, white with metallic lustre, goose, dolphin.

*Lacteus*, from *lac*. I. G. *glakt* (milk). Physical standard, milk itself, soft, creamy white.

*Marmoreus*, from *marmor*. I. G. *mar* (shine, shimmer), cf. μαρμαίρω (shine), μάλός (white), etc. Physical standard, white marble, white with lustrous surface.

*Decolor*, from *color*. Physical standard, the dull, bleached whiteness of old age, in complexion and hair, *decolor artus*. Aen. 8, 326.

*Canus* for *casus*. I. G. *kas* (shine), cf. *casus* (old). Physical standard, silver-gray hair and bud, shining but yellowish.

*Glauus*. Gr. γλαυκός, root *gal* (cf. *gilvus*), bright. Physical standard, sea agitated with foam-crested waves, bluish gray.

*Ater*. Root *ad*. I. G. *idk* (burn), blackness as the result of burning. Physical standard, ashes, *cinis ater*, what is left after all color is burnt out = *decolor*, notion not positive but negative.

*Niger*. I. G. *nit, nat* (slay, kill), cf. *nex, nox, nocere, nixus*, etc., blackness as color of night and sign of death and evil, blackness approached through violet (viola), through green (nexus), through blue water, through red (negro), through yellow (wet sand).

*Fuscus* = *fuscus*, root *far*. I. G. *far* (shake, agitate)—cf. *Farsus*—blackness approached through red and brown. Physical standard, negro's complexion. Met. 33, night-bird's wings.

*Fumus*, root *fum*. I. G. *fis* (bell, smoke). Physical standard, smoke, with blue or brown tinge.

*Albus*. I. G. *pal* (cf. *palidus*, etc.), bluish gray approaching blackness. Physical standard, spots on sheep. Gg. 3, 383.

*Albus* = *albus*, root *al*. I. G. *al* (square), cf. *albus, alvus*, etc. Physical standard, a little milk, dry, dark black sweat mingled with dust running down the arm. Aen. 2, 512.

After this survey of the etymological data and the physical standard is reached, we turn to the logical part, the method of our investigation. We find that the colors are not only a series of variations under particular conditions of position, of temperature and of contrast. In my own case, as in the case of the human eye, in this way, all the colors of the spectrum are not only mixed, but also separated. The details of this method have been given in a paper to the student that each will find in the appendix. A deep knowledge of physiology with the physical standard is necessary. The logical part of these colors is now to be given, not as a series of separate

monographs than to a general discussion of Vergil's color-system. As general result of my separate studies, I may boldly say that in no single case does Vergil ever extend the use of any color-term beyond what science recognizes as the possible limit of its extension. His application of his color-terms is often imaginative and sometimes startling ; but there is no Vergilian application of any color-term that is not correct and even accurate according to the principles of chromatics. Leaving this subject, then, as unfit for discussion except in special treatises, I pass on to the last great question that is involved in the color-system of the poems. Is any comparison possible between color as imagined in the poems of Vergil and color as diffused in the visible objects of the universe? How far does the color-system of Vergil agree with the color-system of nature? In the distribution and quantities of each color respectively, how far does the world as represented in Vergil's poems agree with the world that actually exists?

Color, as we know, arises in nature from the breaking up of white sunlight, by absorption and reflection, into colored lights of various hues. The spectrum gives us power to break up the sunlight at pleasure ; it even gives us power to measure with absolute accuracy the fractional amount of each color that is present in every unit of white light. In every thousand parts of sunlight, each color, red, green, violet, etc., is present in a fixed proportion ; consequently, amid all the infinite play of colors that makes the ever-varying charm of the visible universe, however various the combinations, there is a fixed and unvarying quantity of each color always present. In every 1000 parts of white sunlight that beats upon the earth, there is of red light 330 parts, red-yellow 155, yellow 110, green 87, green-blue 67, blue 74, violet 177.

As said above, if we leave out the terms for white, gray and black, there are in Vergil's poems 350 uses of high color. That is, in every thousand parts of light, as the world showed itself to Vergil, of red light there were 220 parts as opposed to 330 in the spectrum ; red-yellow, 117 as opposed to 155 ; yellow, 160—110 ; green, 186—87 ; green-blue, 74—67 ; blue, 88—74 ; violet, 0—177. That is, the world of Vergil's imagination, as compared with the real world, is defective in red, red-green and violet, and is excessive in yellow, green, blue and blue-green ; or, to put the same facts into a more convenient form, Vergil's sense of color is fullest at the middle of the spectrum in yellow, green, green-blue and blue, and is defective at both ends, in red and red-yellow and especially in violet.

The excess is to be explained by the poet's preference for warm colors over cold and for the more luminous over the less luminous colors. The warm colors are, in painter's language, the reds, red-yellows and yellows that make the upper half of the spectrum. Of these there are in Vergil 497 parts in the thousand; but Vergil's purple also is a warm color because of the red that is in it, and of purple he has 154 parts. Thus, in every thousand parts of light, Vergil saw 651 parts of warm color as opposed to 349 parts of cold color. But in the spectrum there are 595 parts of warm color as opposed to 405 parts of cold color. Thus the genius of Vergil, in his picture of the universe, errs from the exact truth of nature by an excess of warm coloring. The poet's imagination, to that extent, idealizes the facts of nature by a warmer and brighter presentation of the visible world. His world stands to the real world as a portrait by Titian to the face of the human original. Again, in respect of luminosity, the colors of the spectrum grade downward from yellow, the most luminous, through green and red and blue to violet, the least luminous of all. Here, too, as idealizing artist, Vergil prefers the luminous colors. In yellow, for example, he has 160 parts against 110 of the spectrum; in green he has 186 parts against 87 in the spectrum; in reds including purples he has 374 parts against 330 in the spectrum. But in blues he barely reaches the proportion of the spectrum, and in violet he is totally deficient (0 against 177).

These facts are all significant of Vergil's genius. His perceptions of color are clearest and strongest at the middle of the spectrum; even in his sensuous imagination he is temperate and reserved, avoiding the extremes of sensation, and dwelling by preference upon the mean terms, the *media via* of visual perception. But, in lighting up his imaginary world, he is, in his perfect art, not realistic but boldly an idealist. By unconscious selection he floods his canvas with the warm glow of reds and purples and yellows, and brings down the use of cold colors far below the measure of their actual diffusion. And again, with the eye of the poet, anticipating the analysis of science, he discerned the colors that had the highest degree of luminosity, and lifted his glowing picture of the world far above the actual light of nature, by giving preference to the colors that are the most luminous, the most effective and far-reaching as well upon the eyes as upon the imaginations of mankind. Thus, even in this point of color, the works of Vergil's genius stand out as creations of a nobly ideal art, temperate in all things, won-



derfully true to nature, but rising boldly above nature both in the luminosity and in the warmth of their coloring.

But the color-system of Vergil differs most from the color-system of nature by the total absence from it of violet. In the solar spectrum, as we saw, in 1000 parts of white light there are 177 parts of violet; but in Vergil's spectrum there is no violet at all, and the spectrum ends after *caeruleus* in *niger*. This absence of violet from the Vergilian system is strong confirmation of the theory that the conscious perception and the naming of the colors have followed a law of natural sequence. Those colors that produce the strongest effect upon the eye were the first to be noticed and the first to be named; and the strength of the color-effect and, therefore, the priority of the color-term are dependent upon the wave-length of the color itself. Thus red was the first color to be noticed and to be named; then orange, then yellow, then green, then blue, then at last violet. For example, when the Homeric poems were composed, red, orange and yellow were the only colors much noticed or distinctly named; green was the frontier-color; blue and violet were unnoticed and unnamed. But mankind grew on both in its observation of color and in its power of giving names to the colors observed.

A thousand years passed by. Vergil came forward, as the poet of the Roman empire and of the Italian people, to give us his poetic representation of the world. See now the advance in color from Homer's time to Vergil's. Green is added on to red and yellow as part of the color-system of nature, and blue is added on to green. But at blue the progress is arrested. Of violet, the last color of the spectrum, the color of the shortest wave-length, there is in Vergil no conscious vision and no distinct name. But the genius of Vergil stands on the very verge of the final discovery. The lovely color that lies below blue, closing the glories of the spectrum, as we can see by many allusions in Vergil's poems, was dimly present before his eyes and in his imagination. His genius was already laboring at the task of giving to it expression in language. Sometimes it is by *niger* that he seeks to express the mysterious color through which blue light passes into blackness. Sometimes by a confusion of sight which still prevails among more than one-half of civilized men, he confounds violet with purple, and calls it *purpureus*. In one line of exquisite beauty he combines the two methods, in order to find expression for the violet color that floated as a distinct impression before his mind:



*violae subluet purpura nigrae* (Gg. IV 275),

"The purple of the black violet tones down its color."

Here, then, in this attempt of Vergil to complete his color-system by the discovery and naming of violet, we must take our leave of the great poet that stands half-way, as it were, between Homer and Göthe.

He had advanced beyond the point reached by Homer in substituting varieties of color for degrees of light, as the prime beauty of the physical universe. He had enlarged the spectrum of poetry by carrying his perception of color down from green through blue to the very verge of violet. Above all, he had given precision to the color-terms of his own language, and painted for us a world in which simple colors and combination of colors are worked into an almost perfect glory of color-effects. And even in respect of violet, although he did not succeed in expressing what he saw, he felt the color-impression that he could not name; the poet's eyes had been blessed with the dimly felt sensation of that color which is the last exquisite perfection of the spectrum.

THOMAS R. PRICE.

## II.—HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL REMARKS INTRODUCTORY TO A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GREEK ACCENT.

### I.

Accent is a universal phenomenon in language, and one which is in close union with what is treated by grammar under the head of sound or phonology.

The sounds of a word without accent are merely separate stones which accent cements into a linguistic entity, either a word or a sentence. W. v. Humboldt says: 'The unity of the word is produced by the accent. This, by itself, is of a more spiritual nature than the sounds, and it is therefore called the soul of speech, not only because it is really the element which carries intelligibility into speech, but because it is, more than other factors in speech, the immediate expression of feeling' (cited by Götting, *Accent der griechischen Sprache*, p. 8).

The word accent in modern terminology is unfortunately compelled to do duty for more than one linguistic fact. First, in the case of the word, it signifies the *relative* stress and pitch characteristics of its various syllables, with no restriction to that syllable which has the strongest stress or the highest pitch. This is the most scientific function of the word. A closer study of the life of the word cannot be satisfied with a theoretical analysis of its sounds and syllables and a superficial recognition as to which of the syllables has the highest pitch or strongest stress, but it must be known also in *what way* or to *what extent* this syllable is elevated above those surrounding it. Furthermore, the relations of the remaining syllables to one another will always show that the same characteristics which distinguish the tone-syllable *κατ' ἐξοχήν* attach themselves in a lesser degree to some one or more of the remaining syllables; in short, I would define word-accent in this wider sense as the history of stress and pitch in the immediate practical subdivisions of the word, its syllables. This definition of accent has necessarily to be kept apart from that other more familiar one by which, in the current parlance of grammar, the pitch or stress of the most accented syllable is designated. This, of course, is not all. For just as the

word has its history of pitch and stress, so has the sentence. The members of the sentence stand in a relation to the sentence as a whole which is not unlike that in which the syllables stand to the word. Here, of course, the word 'accent' has again to do double duty: first, it indicates the relative characteristics of the words which make up the sentence, and, secondly, the word is also employed to mark that favored member of the sentence which holds the most prominent position, *i. e.* the one which corresponds to the 'tone-syllable' in the word.

In the sentence 'he did it, not she,' we may speak of accent in its most pregnant sense and refer merely to the two summits 'he' and 'she,' or on the other hand we may call before our minds a picture of the exact relation of each of the words in pitch and stress, not giving our attention merely to the summits, but watching the undulation of the tone-line in which the sentence moves all along, from the beginning to the end. This is the study of accent in its scientific sense.

That the accent of a sentence is as much under the influence of an organic law of some kind as the accent of the word is seen as soon as one attempts to disturb the natural cadence of a sentence such as the one cited above. By transferring the summit pitch and ictus to the second word of the sentence we destroy the organic life of the sentence fully as much as though we change the summit pitch and stress in a single word. 'He *did* it, not she' is as much not an English sentence as 'development' is not an English word. Frequently the change of relation in pitch and stress does not go so far as to destroy the sentence, it simply makes another sentence out of it, as for instance when the summit tone is shifted successively from one word to another in the group of words 'give me that book.' We obtain four different sentences corresponding to the four different positions of the summit tone.

With this last case may be compared the way in which, *e. g.* in Greek, the change of accent changes entirely the character of certain words otherwise the same, and in fact enters as a considerably fruitful factor into word-formation. For instance, *corrus* is an agent-noun or participial formation meaning 'running,' 'a runner'; *corrus* is an action-noun or abstract, 'a running,' 'a course'; *corrus* means 'bearing'; *corrus* 'a bearing,' 'a tribute'; both couples are formations identical in every respect but their accent: the accent makes the same phonetic groups into two words as distinctly differentiated in function as two primary noun-formations from the same root can.

be. And, lest it be suspected that it was merely the superfine linguistic genius of the Greeks which brought in so delicate a factor as a power in word-formation, it may be stated at once that this difference is prehistoric, and Indo-European; the couplet *φορός* and *φόρος* makes a perfect proportion with Sanskrit *bharás* 'bearing' and *bhāras* 'a bearing,' 'a burden.' In the same manner cf. in Greek *μητροκτόνος* 'killing his mother' as epithet of Orestes, and *μητρόκτονοι* 'slain by a mother' as epithet of the children of Medea, the accent alone is the factor which has produced two distinct categories in noun-composition, also prehistoric and Indo-European, and up to date not understood by the familiar guides for the study of Greek.<sup>1</sup>

The chapter on sentence-accent is one of the most difficult and obscure in the study of grammar, and has been brought within the range of scientific discussion only very lately. Of course certain obtrusive phenomena which belong under this head had been noticed and discussed long ago; as for instance the fact that certain words lose their independent accent in the sentence, namely, the

<sup>1</sup> *Μητρο-κτόνος* means literally 'mother-slaying'; it is the kind of compound which is called *taṭpuruṣa* by the Hindu grammarians, that is, a simple compound in which the first member stands to the second in the relation of a case dependent upon it. *Μητρό-κτονοι* is a secondary adjective compound, what is called in Hindu grammar a *bahuvrīhi* compound, one upon which the idea of possession and the like is secondarily engrafted; the meaning is strictly speaking 'possessing,' i. e. being affected by a mother-slaying. The stem *κτονω-* in the two compounds is not the same; in the first instance it is the nomen agentis *κτόνος* 'slaying,' in the second it is the nomen actionis *κτόνος* 'a slaying.' The difference of tone in the two compounds represents one of the most noteworthy archaisms in Greek nominal accentuation. Simple dependent compounds like *μητρο-κτόνος* were originally accented on the second member of the entire compound; this law is so strongly alive in the Greek compounds of this class, whose second member is a noun of agency in *-ός*, that the law for recessive accentuation is observed only so far as it does not annul the older law according to which the tone must be on the second member, therefore *μητρο-κτόνος* is against the recessive tendency. On the other hand, possessive compounds were originally accented on the first member, and in accordance with that, such compounds follow freely the laws of recessive accentuation, as *μητρό-κτονοι*. The same law reveals itself in such accentual difference as is contained in Sk. *yajñakāmas* 'desire of sacrifice,' and *yajñā-kāmas* 'having desire of sacrifice'; the former is a simple dependent, the latter a secondary possessive compound. The Sanskrit regularly differentiates such compounds by varying accentuation, while in Greek the archaic differentiation of accent is preserved only sporadically. See L. v. Schroeder in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, 101 fg., esp. pp. 106, 110 and 116; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§1247, 1264 fg. and 1293 fg.

enclitics and proclitics ;<sup>1</sup> certain words change their accent according to their position in the sentence : the so-called *anastrophe*<sup>2</sup> of

<sup>1</sup> That the proclitics do not lack an etymological accent (cf. below, p. 56), but that they lose their accent from syntactical causes, *i. e.* from their relation to other words in the sentence, can often be shown easily, either by pursuing their history within the language itself, or by comparison with corresponding words in other languages. For instance, *ὅ* proclitic appears at the end of a sentence and in some other cases as *ὄ* ; *ὥς* and *ἐξ* when they follow the governed word appear as *ὠς* and *ἐξ* (*θεὸς ὠς*, *κακῶν ἐξ*). That the proclisis of *ὁ*, *ἡ* is not due to some etymological peculiarity of these words is shown by the Sanskrit correspondents *śa*, *śā* ; *oi*, *ai* the special Greek new formations for older *τοί*, *ταί* (Sk. masc. *te* = *toi*) are made analogically after *ὁ*, *ἡ*, and borrow from them their proclisis. In the same manner no doubt all proclitics lose their accent owing to syntactical relations, *i. e.* their lack of accent is due to Greek laws of sentence accentuation. About enclisis we will have much more to say below.

[It is almost needless to add that the word 'proclitic' is a modern invention brought into currency by G. Hermann (Göttling, p. 387). That does not militate against the existence of the thing ; only there seems to have been no recognition of it in antiquity, and the omission of the accent in the cursive MSS was due to differentiation, to the desire of distinguishing not only between *ὁ* and *δ*, *ἡ* and *η*, *οἱ* and *οἶ*, *αἱ* and *αἶ*, but also between *ὅ* and *ὄ*, *εἰς* and *εἶς*, *ἐν* and *ἐν*, *ἐξ* and *ἐξ*, the *spiritus asper* not being heard at that time. See G. Uhlig, *Zur Wiederherstellung des ältesten Compendiums der Grammatik*, Festschrift zur Begrüssung der XXXVI Philologenversammlung, p. 80.—B. L. G.]

<sup>2</sup> The true explanation of *anastrophe* is as follows : Originally 'prepositions' were oftener or as often 'postpositions,' *i. e.* the position of these small words in the sentence was a free one. This is clear, especially from the Vedic Sanskrit, where some of the most common ones occur oftener after their nouns than before them (*e. g.* *ā* 'to' occurs in the Rig-Veda 186 times after its case and only 13 times before it). The mere fact that in later periods of language (*e. g.* Greek and classical Sanskrit) the tendency is to place them before their cases in itself proves nothing against this natural assumption. The case of a monosyllabic preposition like *ἐξ*, which receives its natural accent after the word it governs, but is proclitic when it precedes it, points to the probability that the true accent of these Greek particles must be looked for in their postpositive position. Indeed, just as *ἐξ* (orthotone), so do all bisyllabic prepositions appear with their true accent when they follow their cases, and just like *ἐξ* (proclitic) do all bisyllabic prepositions exhibit a *substitute for proclisis* when they accent their ultimate. The grammars which regard the oxytonesis as the original accentuation, of course explain it as due to a desire on the part of the language to point to the word governed by means of the accent, but such an explanation needs hardly to be refuted.

The originality of the tone of bisyllabic prepositions in *anastrophe* is proved in addition by the fact that this accent is demanded by the corresponding Sanskrit words whenever the etymology is clear. So Sanskrit *āpa* is not to be compared with Greek *ἀπό* but with *ἀπο* ; Sk. *āpi* not with *ἐπί* but with *ἐπι* ; in the same manner the archaic character of the accentuation in *πέρα*, *πάρα* and

oxytone bisyllabic prepositions, which, as is now generally believed, preserves the original accentuation of these prepositions. The change of an acute to a grave on an oxytone before another word, though a phenomenon totally unexplained,<sup>1</sup> contains no doubt a

*ὑπο* is warranted by Vedic *p̄dri*, *p̄drā* and *úpā*; the etymology of *μέτα* and *κάτα* is obscure, but they probably, like those preceding, have preserved their original form in paroxytonesis; *ὑπερ* is not to be directly compared with Sk. *up̄dri*, which is reflected exactly in the oxytone *ὑπείρ*; *ὑπερ* may have preserved an originally different accentuation, or it may have followed secondarily the accent of the other prepositions which suffer anastrophe, aided perhaps by the accent of *ὑπερος* = Sk. *úpāra*. On the other hand *ἀμφί*, which does not suffer anastrophe, is borne out in its oxytonesis by Sk. *abhi*; *ἀντί* to be sure is oxytone after the case which it governs, against the accent of Sanskrit *anti*; but it may have left the company of the prepositions with anastrophe, because it differs from all of them in having its first syllable long (by position). In fact it appears to be a law, unnoticed even by Benfey, the author of this explanation of anastrophe, that only prepositions of two short syllables are affected by it (*ὑπείρ* always oxytone, but *ὑπερ*—*ὑπέρ* with anastrophe). The etymology of *ἀνά* and *διά* is obscure, but there is again no reason to doubt that their oxytonesis is based on good etymological grounds. The fact that these prepositions were originally paroxytone is proved also by the fact that they are so accented in adverbial function. Prepositions were originally adverbs, which have become attached to certain cases secondarily and in relatively later periods of language. Many common prepositions in Greek are still adverbs in Vedic Sanskrit: *d̄pā*, *p̄rā*, *p̄drā* (*āpo*, *pró*, *pāra*), while *p̄dri* (*p̄tri*) does function for both; conversely the Vedic *āti* (*ēti*) is both adverb and preposition, while in Greek it has remained adverb only.

The assumption that such accentuation as *ἀπό*, *παρά*, etc., contains a substitute for proclisis is easily vindicated. As a matter of fact only monosyllables are toneless in proclisis; the treatment of bisyllabic words in the same position is in perfect accord with the treatment of enclitics when these contain a too great number of morae. Just as enclisis is restricted to three morae and two syllables (therefore *λόγος τις*, but *λόγοι τινές*, cf. below, p. 42), so proclisis is restricted to one syllable and two morae (therefore *ἐκ πάντων*, but *περὶ πάντων*). The author of this ingenious explanation of anastrophe is Benfey ('Die eigentliche Accentuation des Indicativ Praesentis von *εἶς* *sein* und *φα* *sprechen* sowie einiger griechischen Praepositionen,' Göttinger Gelehrte Nachrichten, Febr. 27, 1878, p. 165 fg., reprinted in *Vedica und Linguistica*, p. 90 fg.); he closes his article with the following remark: "... es ist nicht besonders rühmlich für die griechische Philologie, dass, nachdem sie mehr als zwei Jahrtausende mit verhältnissmässig geringer Unterbrechung geübt ist, noch in ihren jüngsten Lexicis und Grammatiken, die Formen *ἀπό*, *ἐπί*, *παρά*, *περί*, *ὑπό*, *κατά*, *μετά* aufgestellt werden, welche in der Sprache weder je vorkommen noch vorkommen konnten.'

<sup>1</sup>An elaborate discussion of this difficult question, which space forbids us to reproduce even in a condensed form, is contained in the essay of Leonhard Masing: *Die Hauptformen des Serbisch-Chorwatischen Accents, nebst einleit-*

difficulty whose solution will depend upon further investigation in sentence-accent. The difference between interrogative and indefinite pronouns (interrogatives, orthotone; indefinites, enclitics) is a case where *sentence-accent*, apparently, has given the language a method for differentiating an originally single category into two; this also is not understood, but the archaic character of this phenomenon is warranted by similar methods in other languages.<sup>1</sup> And it has been urged lately that two different word-forms which perform the same function, may owe their difference in form to different intonation in sentence nexus.<sup>2</sup>

enden Bemerkungen zur Accentlehre des Griechischen und des Sanskrit, St. Petersburg, 1876, p. 19 fg.

<sup>1</sup> The relation of *τίς*, orthotone and interrogative, to *τις*, enclitic and indefinite, is evidently the same as that of the German interrogative 'wer' to the indefinite 'wer' in such sentences as the following: '*Wer* ist gekommen?' and 'Es ist *wer* gekommen.' We recognize at once that the enclisis of the indefinite is due to its peculiarly subordinate position in the sentence and not to any etymological deficiency, it is therefore a feature of sentence-accent. Cf. the still less clear method of the Sanskrit for differentiating interrogatives from indefinites. By various particles (some enclitic and others orthotone: *ca*, *cand*, *cit*, etc.) the interrogative without losing its own tone becomes indefinite, thus *kás* 'who?' *kác ca* 'any one'; cf. Lat. *quis* and *quisque*, identical in form and meaning. Whitney, *Sk. Gram.* §507; Delbrück, *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, pp. 138, 145.

<sup>2</sup> The most striking instance of this kind is an attempt to account for the different forms of the third person plural of the copula. It is true that the various forms of it, Doric *ἐντι*, Attic *εἰσι*, Ionic *ἔασι*, cannot be carried back to any one origin by any phonetic jugglery. Accordingly complicated processes of analogy have been resorted to generally in order to harmonize these forms. Gustav Meyer's view, *e. g.* is that *σ-αντι* is the Greek 'ground-form.' From this form he derives *ἔασι* by assuming that the *ε* was added secondarily from the strong forms of the root (*e. g.* *ἔσσι*) to *\*ἔασι* for *\*ἀντι*, *i. e.* *\*σ-αντι*; while Doric *ἐντι*, Attic *εἰσι*, are also to be derived from *\*ἀντι* by assuming that the initial vowel was assimilated to the *ε* of the strong forms. Others employ other processes of analogy in order to harmonize these forms with one another. But Joh. Schmidt has taught for some years past that Doric-Attic *ἐντι*—*εἰσι* is to be referred to a form *\*σ-ἐντι* (= Germ. *s-ind*, Zend. *h-eñā*), while *ἔασι* is to be referred to *\*σ-αντι* in the manner exhibited above. The two forms *\*σ-ἐντι* and *\*σ-αντι* are explained as, originally, respectively the orthotone and the enclitic forms of the word in accordance with the ideas of Wackernagel as laid down in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, XXIV, p. 457 fg., cf. below, p. 56 fg. Of these two forms *σ-ἐντι*, the orthotone form, crowded out *\*σ-αντι* in Doric and Attic, while *vice versa* *\*σ-αντι*, the enclitic form, gained the supremacy among the Ionians. This explanation is laid down with a very slight modification in the doctor-dissertation of his pupil, Felix Hartmann: '*De Aoristo Secundo*,' p. 68, while



From the first opening out of the accented Vedic texts, a very important fact bearing upon sentence-accentuation had been noticed. In Sanskrit the finite verb in principal clauses is enclitic, while in subordinate clauses it is orthotone; this fact lay fallow until Jacob Wackernagel, in the 23d volume of Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, p. 457 fg., showed that the Greek verbal recessive accent is nothing more than this enclisis of the finite verb extended to all kinds of sentences, subordinate as well as principal, but at the same time modified by that peculiar law of Greek according to which enclisis cannot extend beyond three morae. Wackernagel's ingenious discovery we will discuss in full further on; the point which is to be recognized here is the fact that the study of sentence-accentuation is destined to a prominent place in the grammars of the future, and that the present generation of scholars will, beyond a doubt, see this develop into a science; the delicacy of the subject will call for the keenest penetration, but this will be rewarded by the importance of the results; results of comparative grammar alike valuable to the phonetist, the morphologist, and above all perhaps the student of syntax.

The study of accent in these two forms (sentence and word-accent) has then gained a distinct place in grammar. It may be mentioned also that the phonetist recognizes phenomena closely parallel to these in the structure of the syllable. The syllable also has a relative accentuation, *i. e.* its various parts exhibit different degrees of pitch and stress, and like the word the syllable has usually one summit, which is a sonorous element, most frequently a vowel, as *e. g.* in *hánd*; often a lingual or nasal as in the second syllable of *anchrrrite*, *anglng*, *handsmmst*. That the summit accent is variable in position, according to the character of the syllable, can be readily observed in taking a set of pairs of syllables which vary from one another in their final consonants, these being in the one case surd and in the other sonant: *seed* and *seat*, *pease* and *piece*, *brogue* and *broke*; the syllable tone of *seed*, *pease* and *brogue* is upon a part of the vowel nearer to the final consonant than in *seat*, *piece* and *broke*. Further, there may, just as in word-accent, be more than one summit-accent, especially in long syllables.

Schmidt himself has returned to the expedient of analogy in KZ. XXV, 591. Hartmann also employs Wackernagel's ideas on sentence-accent in order to explain the various forms of the second aorist, *ibid.* p. 66. And Wackernagel himself (KZ. XXIV, p. 470) accounts for the loss of augment in preterits by assuming different accentuation in subordinate and principal sentences.



If the syllable 'yes' is pronounced in a contemplative way, *e. g.* in the sentence 'yes, that may be so,' it receives two summits with a decided fall between them. In general it can be noticed that in isolated syllables the relative accentuation of the various sounds gains especially clear expression; so *e. g.* in the various uses of the word 'well' in such connections as 'well, let's go then,' and 'well, are you ready?' The first 'well' has falling tone, the second rising tone.

The subject of syllable-accentuation so far has not gained a very important place in grammar, and still belongs to the phonetist rather than to the grammarian. But taken in connection with word and sentence-accentuation, syllable-accentuation serves to show that accent has been and still is a constant factor at work upon every infinitesimal subdivision of human speech. If we imagine the course of human speech represented by a line, this line will be a *constantly* undulating one when we wish to mark the varying pitch of the sounds; if we wish at the same time to convey a picture of the varying stress or ictus the line would constantly and gradually vary in thickness. Add to this the fact that this variation in pitch and stress is not the effect of one single kind of accentuation, but of a threefold one, and it will be understood how delicate a subject for investigation it becomes even in living speech. In dead languages the difficulties are increased so as to make it hopeless that all the bearings of accentuation will ever be understood. The discussion must restrict itself almost entirely to accent in its pregnant sense, *i. e.* what we have termed summit-accent; only rarely will the stations for lower pitch or minor stress play a part in the discussion. For all the tradition on the subject, preserved either in accent marks or in the description of contemporaneous grammarians, is restricted to that, and is very fragmentary, as well as vague in its terminology.

The general phonetic bearings of this subject can at present be found most conveniently in Sievers's *Handbuch der Phonetik* (Manual of Phonetics), especially §§32-6, pp. 177-95 (word and sentence-accent) and §§29 and 30 (on syllable tone).

## II.

It seems to-day almost a truism to state that a discussion of accent must start from whatever knowledge there is on Indo-European accent; in other words, that the study of Greek accent must be comparative. This is true precisely as much in this division

of Greek phonetics as in any other, as for instance the study of Greek consonants, where one would not now-a-days presume to say much without bringing in the related languages. This, however, does not exclude the fact that accent is, more than other factors in speech, subject to those forces in language which produce change. The Greek and Latin three-syllable accentuations present so fixed and peculiar a physiognomy even in their earliest phases that one would suspect that this restriction to the last three syllables of the word is something that was inherent in these languages from their origin, yet it has been proved for the Greek that this extremely peculiar accentuation is a development out of a system of accentuation to which such a restriction was originally totally unknown.

The German language to-day exhibits a seemingly fixed law of accentuation, namely, that of the root-syllable. This seems a reasonable accentuation, for of all parts of a word the root would seem to be the most prominent and therefore entitled to superior stress and pitch. Yet no fact in linguistic history is at present so clear as this, that the original German accentuation was *not* restricted to the root-syllable, but was a free movable accent, often upon the root, but hardly less often upon some suffixal element. This is proved by Verner's law, and the accentuation of the root-syllable in the German of to-day cannot be due to anything else than the analogy of those words which, under the old free tone-law, exhibited the accent on the root; an analogy carried out with almost flawless consistency.

This does not exhaust the variety of accentual methods to which Indo-European languages have arrived by various processes, often very obscure. The Lithuanian division of the Lithu-Slavic family consists of Lithuanian proper, Lettish and old Prussian. The last branch has died out without leaving any tradition as to its accentuation; the first, the Lithuanian, exhibits a free accentuation which can be compared and identified with that of the Vedic Sanskrit, in spite of many deviations. The Lettish, which is related as closely to the Lithuanian as the language of Herodotus is to that of Thucydides, has abnegated all historic accentuation and accents everywhere the first syllable.

We need not go so far as the Lithuanian and Lettish to find an equally striking and equally difficult phenomenon. The Aeolic dialect in Greece is differentiated from the other dialects in that it has given up almost entirely the accentuation of the ultimate. Excepting the oxytone prepositions of two syllables and a few

conjunctions like *αὐράρ*, *δράρ*, there can be no accentuation except that of the penultimate and the antepenultimate (Göttling, p. 29). This is one of the main elements in the fabled special resemblance between the Aeolic and Latin, and has been the cause of much nonsense,<sup>1</sup> and this resemblance with the Latin has also given birth to the equally erroneous idea that the Aeolic accent is older than that of the remaining Greek dialects. On the contrary, no one fact in Greek accentuation is clearer than this, that the oxytone words in Greek are generally archaic, that they have more than all others resisted the recessive accent.<sup>2</sup>

To this tendency on the part of accentual systems to change in such a way as to lose its original complexion entirely, the fact is due that the comparative treatment of accent was, until very recently, a method which had not gained a firm hold upon the

<sup>1</sup>All these do not exhaust the varieties of seemingly fixed systems which have been built up upon the debris of the old I. E. accentuation in the various families. In the Slavic languages, the Russian has still preserved noteworthy points of contact with the accented Vedic Sanskrit, but the Bohemian has adopted the same system as the Lettish mentioned above, namely, the accentuation of the first syllable, while the Polish has worked out for itself a still more peculiar system. All its words, excepting those borrowed from adjoining dialects, are paroxytone, and here we are again led to the only reasonable explanation, namely, that the frequent paroxytone accent of I. E. times was here extended into a law.

We can pick a case from the modern Romance dialects which will show the same complete change of accentuation, and which will at the same time carry the solution of the change with it. The words which are the representatives of the old abstract suffix *tāt* (Lat. nom. *tās*, *fraternitas*) are oxytone: French *fraternité*, Ital. *fraternità*; oxytone accent is a most non-Latin quality. A solution for this case which is altogether probable is that the modern oxytonesis has preserved the accentuation of the oblique cases: *fraternitātis*, etc. The English on the other hand holds to the accent of the nominative. In the same the French *conscription* has the accent of the oblique case, *-ōnis*. In a case French *parler* over against Italian *parlare* the accentuation of the ultima

ies its own solution with it still more clearly.

Almost all the important categories of noun-formation which are oxytone are in their original accentuation, as can be seen even from superficial parison. Thus nouns of agency in *-ός*, *σορός* = Sk. *bhāras*; but the nouns action are paroxytone, *φόρος* = Sk. *bhāras*; adjectives in *-ός*, *ήδός* = Sk. *lās*, *ε-λαχός* = Sk. *laghās*, *ώός* = Sk. *āśās*; adjectives in *-ός*, *ἐνθός* = Sk. *birds*; verbal adjectives in *-τός*, *κλυτός* = Sk. *grūds* = O. H. G. *klāt* = *loud* (KZ. XXIII 123), *παιτός* = Sk. *paktās*; the word for father, *πατήρ* = *pitā* = Goth. *fadar* (ibid. 117); the perfect active participle *ειδός* = Sk. *āns* (cf. *ιδία* = Sk. *vidāṣi*). In declension *ποιός*: *ποδός* = Sk. *pād*: *padd*; *Δι(φ)ός* = Sk. *dyāds*: *dīvds*.

minds of investigators. Parallelisms and resemblances between individual facts of Greek and Sanskrit tone-laws were noted very soon; even large collections of words and word-categories which exhibited identical accentuation were made, yet this did not seem to impress investigators with the fact that, unless these resemblances were accidental—and that theory was not advanced—the two languages were committed to the same original accentuation in every part, and that it must be shown why and how they present such important differences in historical times. On the contrary, investigators were content to call in, for Greek as well as Latin, the recessive principle (which after all is not recessive, inasmuch as it stops at the third syllable) as a something gotten no one knows where, perhaps as Bopp has it ‘because the greatest recession of tone expresses the greatest dignity and energy.’<sup>1</sup>

To-day any one who wishes for a hearing on the subject of the accentuation of any Indo-European language must operate with the following principles:

1. The accentuation of any I. E. language is a development out of the common I. E. accentuation, precisely as much so as the sounds and forms of that language, be they ever so changed, and be their analysis ever so difficult or even impossible.

2. The principle which changes accent is precisely the same as that which changes other language matter, regular phonetic change based upon phonetic law. Just as an I. E. consonant is changed in German according to Grimm’s law, so it is possible that, *e. g.* originally oxytone word-categories may become paroxytone in some one language,<sup>2</sup> only this must be shown to take place accord-

<sup>1</sup> Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem des Sanskrit und Griechischen, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Or we will recognize below (p. 42) as important another Greek phonetic law of accent, namely this, that enclisis cannot extend beyond three morae and two syllables. Enclisis in general is an Indo-European quality (*e. g.* Greek *τε* = Sk. *ca* = Lat. *que*, etc., are all of them enclitic), but the Greek restriction as to morae and syllables is a Greek phonetic law in exactly the same sense as, *e. g.* the loss of *f* or I. E. *v*. The Vedic Sanskrit knows no restriction of this kind; a word of any length may be enclitic, as *e. g.* the stem *sama* ‘any one’ (Greek stem *ἀμο-* in *ἀμόθεν*) is enclitic, not only in forms containing two syllables, but in all its forms, *e. g.* acc. *samam*, abl. *samasmāt*, gen. *samasya*. And several enclitic words may follow one another, so several vocatives, or vocatives with cases depending upon them, as *e. g.* Rig-Veda, VII 64, 2: *ṛ rājāna maha ṛtasya gopā . . . yātam*: ‘O ye kings, guardians of great right come hither.’ Here four successive words are enclitic, cf. Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. XI, p. 59.

ing to a law, and this law must like all other phonetic laws be based upon the results of observations exercised upon extensive material.

3. Where no phonetic law can be adduced, the influence of analogy must be the changing factor. So *e. g.* the modern German with its prevailing accentuation of the root-syllable, the significant syllable has been explained above; the influence of analogy in the Greek 'recessive' accent will be discussed further on; it is perhaps the most striking and convincing case of the workings of analogy.

4. The influence of foreign languages and adopted words cannot be left out of account. These usually carry their tone with them from home. So *e. g.* large categories of words in German betoken by their accentuation what is also known otherwise, namely, that they are of foreign descent, *e. g.* nouns in *-tät, -ion*, etc., *universität, institution*, which exhibit foreign accent; the entire class of verbs in *ieren, studieren, marschieren*, in the same manner exhibit French suffix and French accent; according to Grimm words like *reiterei, malerei*, etc., have suffixal accentuation, although they are in their root good German words, because they were formed on the analogy of *melodey* (*μελοδία*), *abtei* (*abbatia*), so that this is an example where a distinct category of German words received both suffix and accent from abroad.<sup>1</sup>

The question which arises next is: What was the character of this Indo-European accentuation from which the various peculiar accentuations of the several languages have developed? Of course the question can be answered only for the smallest part; almost all that is known is restricted to the summit-accent, and even here nothing is absolutely and completely clear. We will here consider only the one fact which, above all others, has gained an unimpugned position, namely, the freedom of position of the summit-tone of the I. E. word; other qualities both of word and sentence-accentuation, which are probably Indo-European, will be discussed further on in connection with the Greek itself.

The fact that the I. E. parent-language knew none of those restrictions as to the position of the tone which we see in almost all the languages that are still alive, and also in Greek and Latin, especially the latter, is seen by a comparison of the accented Vedic

<sup>1</sup> The influence of foreign languages upon accentuation is still more strikingly exhibited in the threefold tone of the German word *grammatik*, namely, *grám-matik*, *grummatik* and *grammatik*. The last contains the French accent (*gram-matique*), the one preceding the Latin (*grammática*), while the first represents the genuine German pronunciation with the tone on the root.

Sanskrit with the Greek and German. This comparison yields the result that the Vedic accent has preserved very closely the old word-accent of the I. E. parent-speech. Of course this result was obtained by the usual methods of comparison. Whatever in Greek and German accent has, upon investigation, proved itself to be archaic, is not only to be found freely in the Vedas, but is usually seen there in the form of a principle of wider scope. So *e. g.* the seemingly irregular accent of the participles and infinitives of the thematic or second aorist in Greek is an archaism on Greek ground. In the Veda this entire tense-system is accented on the same place, the thematic vowel, except in the augment forms, where the augment always takes the tone, cf. below, p. 58. In the same manner it will be observed repeatedly that the Greek cases of oxytonesis are usually of a somewhat disjunct and fragmentary character. Not clear in themselves, they do not yield up any principle until we see them in their full bearings in the accent of Vedic word-categories which accent the ultima. And again in German, Verner's law has shown that the more salient principles of Vedic accentuation, such as the shifting of the accent from the root to the flexional element in the non-thematic conjugations, belong to the oldest property of I. E. speech, cf. below, p. 35, note ; it has also shown that apparently irregular accentuations, such as the Vedic accent of the nouns of relationship, *pítár* but *mātar*, must be carried back to the primitive Indo-European language.

No syllable, then, of an I. E. or Vedic word was, on account of its position or on account of its quantity, unable to bear the summit-tone ; no restriction, such as is seen in the three-syllable accents of Latin and Greek, or in the root-accent of the German, is to be found. Thus *indra*, *indreṇa*, *dnapacyuta*, *dnabhimlātavarṇa*, *agninām*, *abhimatiṣāhd*, *parjānyajinvita*, etc. (Whitney, Sk. Gram. §95) present instances of Vedic accentuation. As far as the meaning and value of this free accentuation is concerned, it must be confessed that little or nothing is known. Indeed, it may be fairly said that, in accordance with the more modest spirit in which linguistic investigation is carried on to-day, no very ardent search is made at present for a cause which distributes the accents over these various syllables. It is felt generally and justly that final explanations of such delicate questions are not in order. The energy of accent-investigators must be directed to an investigation of the simple details of accentuation, and the causes of these variations in the separate languages, before it can be hoped at all that the original

cause of these phenomena will be understood. As long as *e. g.* the restriction of Latin accent to penult and antepenult is a mystery, so long there can be no hope of actually penetrating into the inner life of the accentuation which preceded it.

Yet a noteworthy attempt to explain the I. E. accentuation dates back to 1847. The first one and almost the last one who undertook to describe, systematically, the accent in its historical development in the I. E. languages, and at the same time to assign a cause for its original character, was a French scholar, Louis Benloew, in a work entitled '*De l'accentuation dans les langues indo-européennes tant anciennes tant modernes.*' According to Benloew the summit-accent was originally an accent purely of pitch, a musical accent without stress or ictus. In each word which consisted of more than one syllable, some one syllable was pronounced musically higher than all the others; the syllable which was thus distinguished from the others was, according to Benloew, the chronologically last defining element in the word (*le dernier déterminant*). That is, according to the theory of word-construction which ruled in Benloew's day without opposition, and which is accepted to-day also to a very considerable extent, a word is made up of root, suffix, personal inflexion, case-ending, augment, reduplication and so forth, and whichever one of these various elements in the word had been joined to the word last, that was entitled to this higher musical pitch. So *e. g.* in an augment-tense the augment, in a noun in the genitive the genitive ending; when a word was compounded with a preposition, the preposition. As long as this principle was still in existence, the unity of the word in our sense had not as yet developed; the marked emphasis of the '*dernier déterminant*' directed the attention of both speaker and hearer so strongly to some part of the whole, to some special element in what afterwards became a unit, that it must be supposed that this accentuation was in force in a period previous to that of word-formation in its strictest sense. The cementing of the word as we have it now was produced by an additional force. By the side of the principle of the last determinant there was developed slowly and gradually a logical principle of accentuation whose purpose it was to act without reference, and in fact in opposition to the specializing tendency of the '*last determinant.*' This logical accent, it is assumed, affected the root-syllable, which, in the word as a whole, is the ruling syllable. The further history of accentuation in the separate I. E. languages exhibits, then, a gradual process by which this logical



accentuation gains the ascendancy in the word. This in turn is gradually counteracted and affected by the influence of quantity, which Benloew, with true instinct, regards as the last factor which entered the arena. In Sanskrit, as far as is known, the accent is totally independent of any considerations of quantity; in Greek, quantity, especially of the final syllable, begins to exercise an influence on accent; still truer is this of the Latin, where quantity and accent balance each other almost entirely.

The boldness and the *esprit* of Benloew's thoughts on this subject are quite out of proportion with their sobriety, with the extent of the material upon which they were based. In fact they are in all important respects hardly more than ingenious assumptions. Yet his theories deserve even to-day a certain degree of consideration, for they gained such wide adherence that certain of his thoughts are even now silently accepted. So, above all, the musical character of the early I. E. summit-accent, which has never been proved, and which, if separated from stress, is certainly to our ears an extremely peculiar accentuation. Verner, in his explanation of the Old German accent and its influence upon the mute consonants, starts with this statement: 'The I. E. accent was, in its nature, chromatic (*i. e.* musical), and, in its use, of unlimited freedom of position' (KZ. XXIII, p. 128). He then proceeds to explain his exceptions to Grimm's law, by the assumption that the accent became an accent of stress (expiratory) in primitive German, or possibly a combination of musical and stress accent. Benloew's other important idea, namely, that of the 'last determinant,' has also been revived in our day to explain a phenomenon of the widest extent and of great importance, namely, the variation of stem and accentuation in the non-thematic verbal conjugations.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Greek this variation of stem is preserved intact only in a few cases, and its immediate cause, the shift of accent from the stem to the root, is lost to sight, owing to the leveling force of the recessive accent in verbal accentuation. But the variation of stem-form as well as the accompanying shift of accent is easily established as archaic by comparison with the Vedic Sanskrit, so in the following cases:

<i>el-μi</i>	<i>el(*ei-(σ)ι)</i>	<i>el-σι(*ei-τι)</i> : <i>l-μεν</i>	<i>l-τε</i>	<i>l-ασι(*l-αντι)</i>
<i>el-mi</i>	<i>el-qi</i>	<i>el-ti</i> : <i>i-mdsi</i>	<i>i-thds</i>	<i>i-dnti</i>
<i>Foid-a</i>	<i>Foid-θa</i>	<i>Foid-e</i> : <i>Fid-μεν</i>		
<i>ved-a</i>	<i>vet-tḥa</i>	<i>ved-a</i> : <i>vid-md</i>		

The duals, though they agree in both languages in having weak root-form (and accordingly are accented on the personal endings in Sanskrit), are left out



Benloew's work represents the first and also the last attempt on so pretentious a scale to inquire into the original character, development and history of I. E. accentuation. The next somewhat comprehensive work we owe to the founder of comparative philology, Fr. Bopp, in a book entitled 'Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem des Griechischen und des Sanskrit,' Berlin, 1854. This work has really a much narrower scope, it does not profess to deal with general questions in any way, it merely attempts to give an exhaustive list of those words in Greek which have still preserved the accentuation of the Sanskrit and, therefore, in all probability the I. E. accent.

Yet, incidentally, Bopp does express himself on general matters, and in a way that cannot be called happy, either in its method of treating the question or in the result reached. He recognizes as the principle of Sanskrit as well as Greek accentuation 'the greatest possible recession of the tone to the beginning of the word,' p. 16-17. This mode of accentuation possesses the greatest dignity and strength. The limitation of the summit-tone in Greek to the last syllables he looks upon as a degradation or enervation of

sideration owing to the problematic character of the endings. In this on of stem and accent one fact seems clear beyond all doubt, namely, the weakening of the root is due to the shift of accent to the personal ; but the question arises, what may be the cause of this varying position of the accent? There has been, as far as is known, but one answer to this question, that of F. De Saussure in his *Mémoire sur le Système Primitif des Langues Indo-Européennes*, p. 189, and that is distinctly in spirit of Benloew's theory of the 'last determinant.' Saussure assumes that Friedrich Müller (cf. now also Fick in the 'Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen' 81, Vol. II, part 45, 46, p. 1462) that the so-called secondary personal endings of the verb are more original than the primary, not that the secondary are a result of weakening from the primary, as has been generally held from that day down. The primary endings often differ from the secondary by an initial *i*, and it is thought that this *i* is the same deictic particle which we find, e. g. in Greek *ταυτοί*. Thus

	1 sg.	2 sg.	3 sg.	3 plur.
Primary :	mi	si	ti	nti
Secondary:	m	s	t	nt.

assuming that the secondary endings first entered into verbal formation at these personal endings received the tone, whenever they could, a reasonable explanation is gained for the exceptional position of the three persons of the singular; the endings are only *m*, *s*, *t*, which are not fitted for carrying the tone of the word; therefore the tone remains on the root and preserves in it a stronger position.

language. The accentuation of final syllables or syllables near the end is due to the 'sinking' of the accent from a position nearer the beginning of the word, etc. Nowhere, however, does he indicate in any manner by what process of investigation he came to this result, though these ideas permeate the entire book and are urged upon the reader with an evident fondness on the part of the author. They do not seem to be the result of investigation as to the nature and quality of the accent of these languages; they are in fact not offered as such. They are given merely as the *ex cathedra* opinion of the master who, if any one, has a right to speak *ex cathedra*.

Since Bopp's book, no comprehensive treatise on I. E. accent has appeared, nor is it likely that any such pretentious attempt will be made until investigation in the separate languages has established a better insight into the special accentuations; there is reason to hope that the now recognized importance of the study of sentence-accent will shed much light both upon the original history of accent in primitive times, as well as upon the ways in which the historical accentuations of the several languages developed out of the single Indo-European language.

What we have gained from this discussion of Indo-European accent is, first, the knowledge that the word-accent was a free one, restricted to no special syllable or syllables of the word, and untrammelled by quantity; secondly, that the I. E. language knew certain well-defined laws of sentence-accentuation, the traces of which may be fairly looked for in the separate descendants of it. Thirdly, that the elements which may be supposed to have changed this original accentuation can scarcely be different from those at work elsewhere in the formal life of language, regular phonetic change and analogy. As will be seen, what knowledge we have of Greek accent calls for no other factor and no other principle, nor is it likely that any new principle, as yet unknown, will ever exercise any important function in the progress of this difficult study.

### III.

We turn now to the Greek itself. The literature of the subject, both ancient and modern, up to the year 1875 is carefully collected in the first paragraph of the book of Franz Misteli: 'Über griechische Betonung: Sprachvergleichend-philologische Abhandlungen,'

Paderborn, 1875.<sup>1</sup> Among the ancients the subject is scarcely touched upon in classical times. The first mention of it is in Plato's *Cratylus*, p. 399, where the terms *ὀξύς* and *βαρύς* first turn up; next in order is Aristotle, *Poetica*, chap. 20, where, in addition to the *ὀξύτης* and *βαρύτης* of Plato, a *μέσον* is mentioned, *i. e.* a middle-tone, which has been by some exalted to a most important position in the theory of Greek accent, as we shall see soon. Aristarchus in Alexandria is the next authority in chronological order; but above all other works of the ancients, the source for information is Herodian: *Herodiani technici reliquiae*, collegit, disposuit, emendavit, explicavit, praefatus est Augustus Lentz; especially the first volume containing Lentz's famous preface and the book *περὶ καθολικῆς προσφῳδίας*, to which Misteli gives the first place among his authorities.

In the study of modern writers on this subject one need not go back behind Götting, Carl Götting: *Allgemeine Lehre vom Accent der griechischen Sprache*, Jena, 1835; a book valuable for its digest of the opinions of the Greek grammarians, containing rich collections of material, but of course to-day almost worthless as far as theory and explanation of phenomena are concerned. Next in order are the books of Benloew and Bopp, which have been discussed in the preceding chapter. It may be added that Bopp's book, while almost worthless as far as its general theories

<sup>1</sup> The literature which is given there is more than full enough up to 1875. He omits one book which is practical and valuable for accent of nouns, namely, Chandler, 'A practical introduction to Greek accentuation,' which has appeared lately in a second revised edition, Oxford, 1881. Since Misteli there have appeared in addition to the many and often extremely valuable incidental remarks and minor investigations of comparative grammarians, a few important monographs bearing upon the subject:

Leonhard Masing: *Die Hauptformen des Serbisch-Chorwatischen Accents, nebst einleitenden Bemerkungen zur Accentlehre des Griechischen und des Sanskrit*, St. Petersburg, 1876, valuable for Greek accent in its first half, pp. 1-49, containing especially an exhaustive criticism of all opinions on the grave accent, §44 fg., p. 19 fg.

Jacob Wackernagel: *Der griechische Verbal-accent* (KZ. XXIII, p. 457 fg.), of the greatest importance for the general theory of the so-called recessive accent.

Theodor Benfey: *Die eigentliche Accentuation des Indicativ Praesentis von ἐς und φᾶ*, etc., cited in the note on p. 25. Important for its solution of anastrophe, and its valuable remarks upon enclisis and proclisis.

Leopold von Schroeder: *Die Accent-gesetze der homerischen Nominal-composita dargestellt und mit denen des Veda verglichen*, KZ. XXIV, 101-28; the first systematic attempt to establish Indo-European laws for the accentuation of compounds.

are concerned, is valuable as a clear and comprehensive exhibition of the facts which it treats, namely, the coincidences in the accentuation of Greek and Sanskrit words. Next, the subject owes some noteworthy and ingenious essays to Franz Misteli and James Hadley; Franz Misteli: *Über die Accentuation des Griechischen*, KZ. XVII, p. 81 fg., p. 161 fg.; XIX, p. 81 fg.; XXI, p. 16 fg. After the appearance of Hadley's article these essays were rewritten in book-form: *Über griechische Betonung: Sprachvergleichend-philologische Abhandlungen*, Paderborn, 1875. Hadley's brilliant paper was published no less than three times: On the nature and theory of Greek accent, by James Hadley, from the transactions of the American Philological Association, 1869-70; translated in *Curtius Studien*, V 407-28, reprinted in Hadley's collected essays, edited by Whitney. Hadley's as well as Misteli's theories, which are closely implicated with one another, will be discussed below. Finally, much important material is contained in the four monographs cited in the foot-note on p. 38.<sup>1</sup>

If we now attempt to give a short general statement with regard to the position of the summit-tone as it appears in Greek, comparing it with that of the free I. E. summit-accent which we have seen established, we may best formulate the facts as follows, under two heads:

1. This free I. E. accentuation has been allowed to continue in Greek in all kinds of formations, *excepting finite forms of the verb*, when the free accent did not go beyond the antepenultima, *e. g.* κλυτός : κλέφος = *crutds* : *crdvas*, cf. the Germ. *hlūt* (Ags. *hlūd*); ποῦς : ποδός = *pād* : *padds*; λιπών : ἔλιπον = *ricdn* : *dricam*, *vidvān* : *vidúṣi* = *eidós* (for older *\*idós*) : *idvīa*, etc. See Bopp, *Vgl. Accentuationssystem*, pp. 178-84.

2. In all the finite forms of the verb and in all those formations, verbal, nominal, or otherwise, in which the old accentuation stood before the antepenult, a new principle of accentuation has established itself to the exclusion of the old free accent. The chief trait in this new law is that it does not allow the accent to remain on any syllable beyond the antepenult, but restricts it to the last three syllables of the word. To this law there is scarcely an exception in the entire tradition of Greek; the grammarians have fixed the accent of two Aeolic words which contain diaeresis on the syllable

<sup>1</sup> Misteli, in his list of authorities, mentions also the most important treatises on Latin and Sanskrit accentuation, which do not, however, concern us so directly.

before the antepenult, *Μήδεϊα* in Sappho and the Lesbian *ἐπιμέληϊα*, which are not of enough importance for a general discussion. Götting, p. 20, note 2, and especially Misteli, p. 19, discuss them fully. There are, of course, some words in which the theoretical analysis of forms would lead to seeming exceptions to this law of three syllables, *e. g.* *μέλαινα* if we carry it back to its *\*μέλανια*, or *θύγατρες* if it is derived from *\*θύγατερες*; but this is prehistoric; at the time when the pronunciation was *μέλαινα*, all reminiscence of an earlier *\*μέλανια* was gone. Within these three last syllables the position of the tone evidently stands in relation to the finer measure of mora, as appears clearly in the law that the accent cannot pass beyond the penultimate when the ultimate is long, so that the Greek accent is, to a considerable extent, restricted to the last three morae, *e. g.* in such types as *ῥῆδίκουν*, *διδόειν*, *ἐλέγομεν*. To this there is in fact only one seeming exception and one real one:

1. A seeming exception to this restriction to three morae is offered by such cases as *e. g.* the genitive *κήπου*, where the acute is apparently four morae from the end of the word, but where in reality the second mora of the long penultima has the tone, so that if we analyze into morae and write *\*κεέποο*, it becomes clear that the exception is only apparent. That the acute on a long vowel means the accentuation of the last mora is not a mere assumption, as is shown by such cases as *ἑστῶς* contracted from *ἑσταῶς*.<sup>1</sup> In such cases a contraction has taken place, and if the tone had been on any other than the last mora the result would have been a circumflex; the reason for the absence of the circumflex is to be found in the fact that the last vowel contains two morae (*\*ἑστα-ῶς*), with the first of which, the toneless mora, the *a* contracts; it thus leaves the accent untouched in the result, *ἑστῶς*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> That *ἑστα-ῶς* is the old type of this perfect participle can be seen from the Sanskrit equivalent *tasthi-vān*; here the Sk. *i* equals the Greek *a*, as in *sthi-tās* = *στα-τός*.

<sup>2</sup> The circumflex cannot display itself upon less than two morae (‘’), therefore also this projected *\*ἑστα-ῶς* results in oxytone *ἑστῶς*. A case where this law of circumflex is clearly exhibited is the vocative of the word *Ζεῖς*. *Ζεῦς* (for *\*Διεύς*) is an old oxytone = Sanskrit *dyāṁs*. By an Indo-European law the accent in the vocative recedes to the first syllable of the noun, that is, the tone is as near the beginning of the word as possible. The result for this stem is the vocative *Ζεῦ* (*i. e.* *Ζέῦ*) = *dyāṁs* (*i. e.* *díāṁs*). The recession has taken place, but as the word contains but one long vowel, the tone has passed from the last mora to the first, exhibiting at least for diphthongs the actual divisibility of long vowels into morae.

2. The second exception to the law of three morae is much less easily disposed of. When the tone is on the antepenult and the last syllable is therefore short, but the penult is long, then it stands at least on the fourth mora from the end, as *e. g.* in ἄζωστος; and when both the penult and antepenult are long, apparently on the fifth mora from the end in a case like ἥπειρος.<sup>1</sup> In both of these cases there is, of course, no *a priori* reason why the law of three morae should not have been kept in force by making both words properispomena.<sup>2</sup> The only explanation that the authorities have been able to bring forward is the rather unsatisfactory one which assumes that in such cases the long penultima received a more hurried pronunciation and suffered a loss in quantity. So Götting, p. 27: 'the penultimate loses a part of its quantitative value because the strength of the tone of antepenult outweighs the following long syllable,' and in the same tone other writers down to Kühner. The difficulty in the way of such an assumption lies, of course, in the metrical value of such toneless long penultimates; they are just as inviolably long as any other long syllables; the *ει* of ἥπειρος differs in no way metrically from the *η* of the same word, and the explanation given has quite the appearance of having been constructed *ad hoc* without any sufficient ground. It is not uninteresting that there are quite a number of cases in the language in which both accentuations occur in the same word, one having the tone farther back from the end than the third mora, and the other having it on the third mora. In every case the one which follows the rule of three morae is the older one, *e. g.* ἐρῆμος Epic and in Herodotus, but Attic usually ἔρημος; ὁμοῖος Homeric, Ionic, and Old Attic, later ὁμοιος; τροπαῖον Ionic and Old Attic, common τρόπαιον; in the same way of ἐτοῖμος and ἔτοιμος the first is the more archaic form. In ὁμοῖος : ὁμοιος the historical precedence of ὁμοῖος is easily proven etymologically; ὁμοῖος is a secondary derivative from the oxytone stem ὁμό- = Sk. *samā-* with the secondary suffix -ιο- = Sk. *ya-* (Vedic -ia). By an accentual law, which perhaps dates back to the common

<sup>1</sup> Apparently only if we assume that the tone is on the last mora of ἥπειρος (\*ἑῑπειρος) as in κῆπον (\*κεῑποο).

<sup>2</sup> The extent to which such accentuation is favored in Greek may be best seen in the rendering of such Latin names as *Dentātus*, *Modēstus*, *Athenobdrbus*, etc., by Δέντατος, Μόδεστος, Αἰνόβαρβος, etc. Nothing, except the predilection of the language, is in the way of such an accentuation as Δεντάτος, etc. Hadley in Curtius's Studien, V, p. 413.

Indo-European period,<sup>1</sup> such a combination as  $\delta\mu\acute{o} + \omega$  yields  $\delta\mu\acute{o}\omega$ -, *i. e.*  $\delta\mu\acute{o}\omega$ -, cf. the case of  $Ze\ddot{u}$  (*i. e.*  $Ze\ddot{u}$ ) discussed above on p. 40, note. We might then see in such cases the trace of a still more stringent law in favor of the three morae; possibly the principle which underlies the recessive accent started strictly from that point.

Whatever this law of three morae is, it may be noticed right here that it is also the Greek law for enclisis, *i. e.* a Greek word can incline upon the preceding word only in such a way that the result does not produce conditions which are in conflict with the law of three morae as laid down above. So *e. g.*  $Ze\ddot{u}s\ \mu\omicron\iota$  offers the conditions which are apparent in  $\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\omicron\nu$ ;  $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}s\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ ,<sup>2</sup> the same conditions as  $\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ . When, however, it is desired to incline  $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ ,  $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , or  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , the result is  $Ze\ddot{u}s\ \eta\mu\omega\nu$ ,  $Ze\ddot{u}s\ \eta\mu\iota\nu$  or  $\eta\mu\iota\nu$  (with a shortening of the last vowel which may stand in connection with the removal of the tone from the ultima), etc. That is to say, owing to the fact that these words contain at least four morae they cannot become entirely enclitic, but become so as much as possible. The grammars<sup>3</sup> (*e. g.* Hadley, §232) do not understand this phenomenon, when they describe  $\eta\mu\omega\nu$ , etc., merely as optional weaker forms, and not as enclitic forms.<sup>4</sup> Aside from the testimony in favor of

<sup>1</sup> The circumflex in such cases is probably Indo-European, for in Sanskrit also the acute vowel on the *a* of *samā-* would be followed by the so-called enclitic *stavarita* on the next syllable (*ia*), which seems to imply that the voice instead of sinking from the acute to lowest pitch without mediation, passes down gradually, and this amounts evidently to the same phonetic result as the in  $\delta\mu\acute{o}\omega$ -. See Whitney in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 1870, p. 9; Sk. Gramm. §85.

grammars falsely set up the paradigm  $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ , etc. The words  $\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\iota}$  and  $\epsilon\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  receive this acute only when enclisis of the entire word is possible because the result would leave too many morae unaccented. It is therefore due to sentence-law and is not etymological. The  $\epsilon$  of  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$  is preserved in orthotone  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ , see below, p. 61. The reason why words as well as  $\phi\eta\mu\iota$ , etc., are enclitic will be discussed in full §7.

Trübner calls it 'eine ganz eigenthümliche Art der Deklination,' I, p. 264. The assumption of enclisis in the shorter forms ( $\mu\omicron\iota$ ,  $\mu\omicron\nu$ ), but of orthotonesis in the longer forms ( $\eta\mu\omega\nu$ ,  $\eta\mu\alpha\varsigma$ ), apparently receives support from the Sanskrit, where the enclisis of the personal of the first and second persons, being evidently of a piece with the enclisis of the same persons in Greek, is also restricted to *monosyllabic* forms. The personal of the third person, *i. e.* the various demonstrative stems which have the function, do, however, incline forms of more than one syllable. *e. g.*  $asmai$  'to him,'  $asya$  'of him,' are used both orthotonically and



enclisis that is afforded by the parallelism of, *e. g.* μοι and μου, when compared with ἐμοί and ἐμοῦ, we have most interesting native authority to the effect that in Greek pronouns, the recession of the accent in accordance with the law of three morae was the substitute of enclisis when the word inclined possessed itself at least four morae. Wackernagel, in KZ. XXIII 458, cites from Apollon. Synt. p. 130, a passage, also treated by Lehrs, Quaestiones epicae, p. 123, which bears upon this question: ἤρκεσθῃ ἢ ἔγκλισις διὰ τῆς μεταθέσεως τοῦ τόνου, ἤκουσ' ἡμῶν . . . τῆς τάσεως μετατιθεμένης κατὰ τὴν ἀρχουσιν· ἡδυνάτει γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον προσελθεῖν. This passage, from excellent ancient authority, proves almost beyond a doubt what seems in every other way also probable, namely, that ἡμῶν, ὕμῶν, etc., are cases of enclisis, and that, therefore, enclisis and recessive accent are ruled by the same law of three morae. The same principle is, of course, patent in other well-known attempts to observe the same law; in fact if we take the cases which Hadley gives in §107: ἀνθρωπός τις, παῖδες τινές, λόγοι τινές, we have in every case an enclisis which is rectified or rather cut short by the law of three morae, as exhibited in the general recessive accent; it is to be noted that the position of the tone on the fourth mora from the end is also exhibited here, when the penult has a long vowel and the ultima is short, οὗ φησι like ἡπειρος, λόγοι τι(νές) like ἄζωστος. It will be seen below, p. 56, of what importance it has been thought, that the laws which govern the scope of enclisis, and of recession of the Greek accent, are identical. Wackernagel's theory about the recessive accent, which has commended itself to the acceptance of most modern grammarians, is in the main based upon this coincidence.

## IV.

If, in stating the most prominent views with regard to the peculiar character of Greek accentuation, we were to begin with Göttling, this would be done in deference to a book which must still be kept at one's elbow in the study of this subject. In some respects it might

enclitically, cf. above, p. 31, note 2. It may be further said that the Sanskrit proves nothing against the enclitic character of such forms as ἡμῶν by the side of ἡμῶν, because it happens to possess different polysyllabic forms made from different stems by the side of the monosyllabic ones. It is not surprising that a language which can choose between *asmadbhyam* and *nas* for the dative plural of the personal pronoun of the first person, should choose *asmadbhyam* when it required an orthotone form, but *nas* when it desired enclisis. The Greek has no such choice in the cases involved.



still be necessary to warn against it, while in others it might be mentioned profitably as a scientific *curiosum* of efforts in this direction, not as yet fifty years old. Götting might also perhaps deserve a mention because he represents the last attempt to account for Greek accentuation, entirely out of itself, though even he occasionally takes a glance at the incipient work of comparative philology—he often refers to Humboldt and Bopp—or brings on some real or seeming parallelism from some other language. Occasionally again he sees farther than some of his successors, as when he recognizes the fact that the recessive accentuation began in the non-Aeolic dialects with the finite verb. The neglect of this fact is one of the weakest spots in the theory of Misteli-Hadley, which will be discussed immediately. Yet the limited space of an article forbids any systematic mention of Götting's views, and as the views of Benloew and Bopp are already disposed of, we can at once turn to the Misteli-Hadley theory. Misteli's theory on the peculiar form of Greek accentuation was based upon comparative studies as well as 'philological' investigations in the Greek grammarians. It was first laid down in Vols. XVII, XIX and XXI of Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, and afterwards embodied in the form of a book, whose title was given above, p. 37. In the period between Misteli's articles and Misteli's book there appeared Hadley's article in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association (cited *ibid.*), an article which aimed to rectify Misteli's theory, and which extended it by bringing in the Latin within the framework of the theory. Therefore the name Misteli-Hadley theory.

The key to the explanation of the three-syllable or three-morae accent according to this theory is the assumption of a middle-tone (*mittel-ton*) which, already in the parent-language, followed immediately upon every summit-tone, as a kind of intermediate step which served to bring the voice gradually from the musical height of the summit to the lowest depth (the toneless syllable). Nowhere was the passage from the summit-tone to tonelessness in the same word one which did not involve this middle-tone. If there were syllables left in the word after the two which are bespoken for the summit-tone and the middle-tone, these—and their number is left indefinite—are toneless, or according to the preferable terminology of the German receive the 'tief-ton.' This theory of a middle-tone is suggested in the first place by the Vedic Sanskrit. This possesses a mode of accentuation which distinguishes three kinds of tone, 1. a higher (*udātta* 'raised') or acute; 2. a lower (*anuddātta* 'not

raised'), *i. e.* toneless or 'tief-tonig'; 3. a third, which is called *svarita*, according to Whitney §81 is always of secondary origin, being the result of actual combination of an acute vowel and a following toneless vowel into one syllable. This is uniformly defined by the natives as compound in pitch, a union of higher and lower tone within the limits of a single syllable. It is thus identical, as far as can be seen, with the Greek and Latin circumflex, and in all probability goes back with the circumflex to the common I. E. period, as *e. g.* in the case voc. Ζεῦ : *dyāùs* = nom. Ζεύς : *dyāús*, discussed on p. 40, note 2.

So far everything is in reasonable accord with Greek notions of accent. But there is a further element. 'The Hindu grammarians agree in declaring the (naturally toneless) syllable following an acute, whether in the same or in another word, to be *svarita* or circumflex, unless indeed it be itself followed by an acute or circumflex, in which case it retains its grave tone. This is called by European scholars the enclitic or dependent circumflex,' Whitney, §85. Misteli and Hadley then impugn the statement of the native grammarians that this was a circumflex, and regard it as incomparably more probable that this *svarita* is a middle-tone. And Whitney, who is the first authority in matters of native Vedic grammar, says (§85) 'This seems to mean that the voice, which is borne up at the higher pitch to the end of the acute syllable, does not ordinarily drop to grave pitch by an instantaneous movement, but descends by a more or less perceptible slide in the course of the following syllable. No Hindu authority suggests the theory of a middle or intermediate tone for the enclitic, any more than for the independent circumflex. For the most part, the two are identified with one another in treatment and designation.' Whitney's opinion with regard to the enclitic *svarita*, while it denies it the name of middle-tone, does, we can see, nevertheless support a kind of tone which does not lie very far removed in its nature from that middle-tone in favor of which Misteli and Hadley argue.

But on the other hand the testimony for a middle-tone in Greek which attaches itself immediately to the summit-tone in the manner of the enclitic *svarita* is extremely weak, in fact may be said not to exist at all. Not that there is not mention made by the ancients of other accents than the three familiar ones. Aristotle, *Poetica*, ch. 20, and *Rhet.* 3, 1, 4 mentions a μέσον in addition to the ὀξύτης and βαρύτης of Plato, and this, according to Misteli, p. 44, note, and Hadley, *Cu. Stud.* V 417, is probably a middle-tone, though both

admit the possibility that the circumflex is indicated by it. The Greek grammarian, Tyrannio from Amisus, who was captured by Lucullus and brought to Rome, reports four accents according to Varro (in Servius de accentibus, cf. A. Wilmans de M. Terenti Varronis libris grammaticis, p. 187). Varro mentions other Greek grammarians who report more than three accents; there are in fact those who report six accents altogether. Misteli seeks further (§7, p. 50) to fasten this middle-accent immediately after the summit-tone, in a manner parallel with the enclitic *svarita*, by the aid of a well-known passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus de comp. verborum liber, section XI, but in this attempt he positively fails. The passage reads *διαλέκτου μὲν οὖν μέλος ἐνὶ μετρεῖται διαστήματι τῷ λεγόμενῳ διὰ πέντε, ἰ. ε.* the two limits of tone in spoken speech (between summit-tone and low-tone) are said to be a fifth. Now Misteli argues that this interval must have been mediated by the middle-tone in passing from an accented syllable to an unaccented one, because the unmediated skip of the voice through a fifth would give to the language 'einen schneidenden und widerwärtigen character,' and because Greek 'speech would move in extremes' in such a case. But as Masing, *loc. cit.* p. 23, points out, another passage in the same author makes this construction impossible. For Dionysius continues, not many lines beyond this passage, with the antithesis to the *μέλος διαλέκτου* in the following manner: *ἡ δὲ ὀργανικὴ τε καὶ ψῳδικὴ μουσα διαστήμασί τε χρῆται πλείοσιν, οὐ διὰ πέντε μόνον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ διὰ πασῶν ἀρξαμένη, καὶ τὸ διὰ πέντε μελωδεῖ, καὶ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων, κ. τ. λ.* 'Music, however, instrumental as well as vocal, employs several intervals; not only fifths, but, to begin with octaves, next fifths, fourths, etc.' It is evident from this passage that Dionysius recognizes a plurality of intervals only for music and not for common speech, and it appears that according to this author there is but one interval, the fifth, in use in speech.

Moreover, this passage by no means certainly describes word-accent; so *e. g.* Göttling, who by the way denies that Greek word-accent was musical at all, construes this *διαλέκτου μέλος* as a rhetorical sentence-accent. Certainly it cannot be brought in as testimony in favor of that special kind of middle-tone which follows every summit-accent. Hadley does indeed recognize that the testimony of the ancients for it, or for that matter any middle-tone, leaves much to be desired; but argues that the peculiar effectiveness of it in the theory which he defends and extends is the surer testimony in favor of its actual existence.

The theory is then completed by the following assumption, which is to account for both Greek and Latin accentuation: *There was developed in the Graeco-Italic division of the family, after they had separated from the common stock, a disinclination to allow more than one toneless syllable to follow upon the middle-tone*; this disinclination caused a moving forward of the summit-accent to such a position that there was room after it, and after the middle-tone which necessarily followed it, for only one toneless syllable. Thus originated the Graeco-Italic law by which the summit-accent is restricted to one of the last three syllables of a word. The immediate ancestors of the Greeks and Romans, the 'Graeco-Italians,' before their separation from one another, accented their words alike according to this simple law, *e. g.* \*ελείπομην, \*ἄνθρωπου, \*gaúdērēs, \*légendus, *i. e.* all words which originally had the summit-tone *before* the antepenult simply shifted it to the antepenult, thus producing a very special cadence agreeable to the Graeco-Italic ear, *summit-tone, middle-tone, tonelessness* (low tone). In words which did not have the tone anterior to the antepenult, words like λελυμένος, χαλεπός, the accent remained undisturbed; for here there was no room for the violation of the law that the middle-tone should not be followed by more than one toneless syllable. But as Greeks and Italians divided off they developed their common three-syllable tone-law in a manner which led to pretty sharp differences. The point of departure from the Graeco-Italic law was the *toneless* syllable in the cadence for the Greeks, the *middle-tone* for the Italians.

Let us first remain a while with the Greeks. They developed a dislike for a *long* toneless, *i. e.* final, syllable, so that the Graeco-Italic cadence of summit-tone, middle-tone, toneless syllable, was modified for the Greek into summit-tone, middle-tone, and *short* toneless syllable, whenever the accent had originally, in I. E. times, stood before the antepenult. In order to exhibit the application of this law, Hadley divides the phenomena of the Greek recessive accent into four divisions, and one need but remember in addition that he regards the circumflex as a compound accent containing both summit and middle-tone, in order to understand his reasoning.

1. The simplest case. The acute cannot stand on any syllable before the antepenult, therefore I. E. \*ελείπετο becomes Greek ελείπετο.

2. The antepenult must, if it takes the accent, take the acute; \*ελείπετο (*i. e.* \*ελάπετο) is impossible, because it leaves two toneless syllables at the end.

3. When the penultimate carries the accent and the ultimate contains a long vowel, then this must be the acute, *τοιαύτη*, not *τοιαῦτη* (= \**τοιαῖτη*), because this would result in a *long* toneless syllable.

4. A long vowel in the penultimate must take the circumflex if the ultimate is short, *τοιούτος*, not \**τοιούτος*, because there would be no room for the toneless syllable.<sup>1</sup>

This method of accentuation in the separate life of the Greek also did not gain ground when it was necessary to draw the summit-tone back from the end in order to gain the desired cadence. Therefore types like *λελυμένος*, *λιπών*, remained undisturbed.<sup>2</sup>

Only one division of the Greek people, the Aeolians of Asia Minor, took also this step completely, that is they subjected their entire accentuation to the law of cadence, summit-tone, middle-tone, low tone, therefore *λελύμενος*, *χαλέπως*. Where the entire cadence was not to be procured, as in *σοφός*, they drew the accent back at least as far as possible, *σόφος*.

The theory then proceeds to explain the Latin accent by assuming that the Graeco-Italic cadence-accentuation there also received a modification, namely, that there developed with the Italians a disinclination against a long middle-tone, so that the Latin cadence became summit-tone, short middle-tone, low tone. We will return to the Latin further on and see that this theory accounts for the Latin system about as well as for the Greek. At present the Greek will be dealt with alone.

1. In the first place it has been shown that the assumption of this middle-tone following every summit-tone is a purely theoretic one, and that the testimony of the grammarians in favor of such a middle-tone amounts to nothing at all. Not that it is to be supposed that the Greek word did not possess subsidiary tones just as much as words of to-day; but the assumption of a special middle-tone which must follow the summit, implying that the pitch of the summit was especially high, so as to stand in need of a mediator between it and the low tone, is warranted by no fact of Greek grammar or

<sup>1</sup> This is the weak spot in the arrangement. The theory by which the explanation of the Greek accent is here attempted does not in reality claim that the cadence, *summit-tone*, *middle-tone*, *low tone*, must be established in every case; it makes only the negative claim that after summit-tone and middle-tone *no more than one* low tone should follow. This condition would be satisfied as well by \**τοιούτος* as by *τοιούτος*.

<sup>2</sup> This rule knows exceptions from the earliest times. So e. g. nouns in *-τις* (*-σις*), *ῥῆσις*, *τίσις*, are originally oxytone formations, Sk. *srutis*, *cittis*, and yet appear in all periods of the language with recessive accent, cf. below, p. 50.

tradition. The passage of Dionysius not only proves nothing, but if it speaks of word-accent at all, disproves the existence of any interval in the *διαλέκτου μέλος*, except the fifth.

2. The assumption of a Graeco-Italian accentuation (*ἐλείπομην*, *legendus*) stands entirely in the air. Not one historical fact is in its favor; it is solely based upon the fact of the restriction of the accent to the last three syllables. At the time when Misteli and Hadley wrote, the assumption of a Graeco-Italic period was very generally, though even then not universally, accepted. It is to-day a theory of the past. In just that particular factor of form which stands in especially close relation to accent, namely, vocalism, these families are about as far removed from one another as possible. Further, it will be urged below that the Greek recessive, or, to speak with Hadley, cadence-accent, began with the *verb*; it is precisely in the verb that Greek and Latin have diverged so extensively that mere fragments of the older system of formations are left in the latter, and it is altogether improbable that the Latin should have saved an old system of verbal accentuation for a new and obscure set of formations.

3. The assumption of the sequence, summit-tone, middle-tone, and short toneless syllable, is after all nothing more than the formulation into a more complicated shape of the simple law that the recessive accent does not recede beyond three, or in one case (forms like *ἄζωστος* and *ἥπειρος*) four morae. The theory does not find it possible to free itself from the count by mora any more than the formulation by which the accent was described above. While it appears to dispose of the case of *ἄζωστος* better (for here it was necessary above to assume recession to four morae), it is deficient in cases like *τοιούτος*, because it does not account for the constant circumflex, cf. p. 48, note 1, which on the other hand is accounted for perfectly within the theory of the three morae.

4. Finally, the last objection is one which more than any other undermines the middle-tone theory. The original I. E. succession of summit-tone, middle-tone, low tone, it is claimed was in Graeco-Italian times moved down a place or two or even more in order to pander to a dislike on the part of the Graeco-Italians to allow more than one toneless syllable after the middle-tone. An aesthetic dislike which is powerful enough to reform the accent of an entire language in a thoughtful, laborious manner, is a sufficiently doubtful factor in modern linguistic explanation. It cannot exactly be called a phonetic law, because a phonetic law acts spontaneously, and



would not be likely to count the syllables of a certain word, and then, upon finding that the summit-tone upon a certain syllable would leave too many toneless syllables at the end, move it down a sufficient number of morae to ward off such an event. At least so complicated a process must seem highly improbable when it is compared with the workings of such a law in other quarters. Yet the explanation as a phonetic law might, for lack of a better one, be accepted with reserve, but for the fact that the theory fails to account for a strictly grammatical, and not aesthetic, fact connected with it; namely this, that the recessive accent has most certainly in Greek begun with the finite verb, *where there is practically no exception to it*; that it excludes, with particular care, non-finite forms of the verb in the same tense-system and in evident connection with finite forms, exhibiting thus on Greek ground a most outspoken character as a grammatical quality of finite verbs: *ἔλεπον*, *ἐλεπόμην*, *λίπω*, etc., but *λεπών*, *λεπέω*, *λεπέσθαι*, etc. Of course noun-formations are not spared in historical times. But here the tendency is not regulated by any traceable law. Certain noun-categories become recessive; others, with apparently the same claim to favor, do not; so adjectives in *-ύς* *versus* nouns in *-τις* (*σις*).<sup>1</sup> It is in fact perfectly clear that the recessive accent in Greek, whatever its explanation, started with the finite forms of the verb, and thence succeeded in attacking nominal formations also; it cannot, therefore, have been due to the disinclination of the Graeco-Italians to allow two toneless syllables after the middle-tone. Such a cause cannot have differentiated between noun and verb.

## V.

The strength of Misteli's system as completed by Hadley seems at first sight to lie in the fact that it includes the Latin, which shares with the Greek the sufficiently remarkable quality of restricting the summit-tone to the last three syllables of a word. This coincidence Hadley explains by the assumption of a Graeco-Italic accent which knew no restriction except this, that the assumed I. E. cadence of summit-tone, middle-tone and low tone, when it began before

<sup>1</sup> Both are originally oxytone noun-formations; the adjectives in *-ύς* have remained so, *θρασύς* = Sk. *dhrasús*, *βραδύς* = Sk. *mradús*, *πλατύς* = Sk. *prthús*, *ελαχύς* = Sk. *raghús*, *παχύς* = Sk. *bahús*, *βαρύς* = Sk. *gaurús*, etc.; the nouns in *-τις* have without exception become recessive, as in the cases of *ρίσις* and *τίσις*, cited above, p. 48, note 2.

the antepenult, was moved down to avoid more than one low tone at the end of the word. After the separation of the Greeks from the Italians, the two peoples refined the common Graeco-Italic accent; the Greek by insisting upon summit-tone, middle-tone, *short low tone*, the Lat. by developing a fondness for summit-tone, *short middle-tone*, and indifferent low-tone. Accordingly the Graeco-Italic accentuation, which still permitted forms like *légendus*, *gaúdērēs*, etc., was modified; and this modification again becomes at least superficially easy if the definition and description of the Latin circumflex, as given by the Latin grammarians, is remembered, cf. Corssen, Ueber Aussprache, Vocalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache, II, p. 800 fg. According to them the Lat. circumflex was employed upon long monosyllables (excepting *nē* with the imperative), and on penultimas with long vowels (not, however, by position) when the ultimate was short. Everywhere else the acute was employed according to the remaining well-known rules. How much value is to be attached to the statement that in Latin *gaudērē* had the circumflex, made as that statement is by grammarians who were under the influence of Greek grammar down to the minutest particulars, is after all an open question; even Curtius, a strong supporter of the Graeco-Italic accentuation, has said in my hearing that "der Circumflex im lateinischen bedeutet überhaupt nicht viel, ist mehr auf Theorie gegründet."<sup>1</sup>

But the assumption of the existence of the circumflex, and the cadence projected for the Latin, summit-tone, *short* middle-tone, and low-tone, seemingly procure a satisfactory arrangement of the historical phenomena.

The simplest case is that of types like *légērē* and *légērēt*; here the cadence, summit-tone, short middle-tone, and low-tone, is easily procured. In the type *gaudēre*, the same result is procured by dividing the circumflexed *ē* between summit-tone and middle-tone, quasi *\*gaudēērē*. Greater is the difficulty in the type *gaudērēs*, for the first *ē* is not circumflexed, therefore the syllable *rēs* must furnish the place for both middle-tone and low-tone, *\*gaudērèēs*; but who will after all believe that there was so thoroughgoing a

<sup>1</sup> Petrus Lange is the strongest assailant of the Latin circumflex, in three treatises: De grammaticorum latinorum praeceptis quae ad accentum spectant, Bonn, 1857; in a critique of Weil and Benloew's Théorie générale de l'accentuation latine, in Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, Vol. 79, 1859, p. 44-71; Untersuchungen über den lateinischen Accent, in Philologus 31, p. 98-121.



difference in the accentuation of the two words *gaudērē* and *gaudērīs*, or upon what tangible fact in the life of the language is this differentiation based? And in the type *legendūs* we are left without a place for the low-tone, because *gen* cannot take the circumflex, *\*legendūs*, while the type *legendī* again divides its final long syllable between middle and low-tone, *\*legendīi*. Here the arrangement is weakest; it institutes a complicated difference between the accent of *gaudērē* (*gaudērē*) and *legendūs* (*legendūs*  $\equiv$ ), which is devoid of all foundation in the actual and not hypothetical life and history of the language.

Of the four main objections which were urged above against this theory when applied to the Greek, three hold good against Latin also; others can be added from the point of view of the Latin itself.

1. The still more complete absence of testimony in favor of a middle-tone which regularly followed the summit-tone. There is no such testimony at all to be obtained from the Latin.

2. The assumption of the Graeco-Italic accent, against which what was said above, p. 49, is to be compared.

3. The combination with Greek recessive accent, which has originated with the verb, and will be shown below to be due to an I. E. law pertaining to the verb, which therefore separates that method of accentuation incontrovertibly from the Latin, where the special influence of the verb is not to be thought of, and has not, as far as is known, ever been suggested.

4. The very similarity of the Latin accent to the Greek becomes, if we look more narrowly, reduced to the restriction of the tone to the last three syllables. In every other respect the accentuations of the two languages stand in the sharpest opposition to one another.

a. In Greek the summit-tone is not excluded from the last syllable, in Latin it is so entirely.

b. In Greek the penult is absolutely without influence as far as deciding the position of the summit-tone is concerned; in Latin the penult is the pivot around which everything revolves, its quantity decides the position of the accent.

c. Just as indifferent as the penult is in Greek, so in Latin the ultima has no influence upon the position of the accent, while in Greek it is the main factor in determining the position of the recessive accent.

5. A fifth reason against the assumption of the Graeco-Italic accent is presented by the fact that there are distinct traces in Latin of an accentuation which was not restricted to the last three syllables

The law of three syllables was preceded in an archaic period by a freer accentuation, the vestiges of which are not sufficiently numerous to make it possible to describe its exact character, though enough can be seen to render it probable that it did not know this restriction, at least not in the form of an inviolable law.

a. Very strong indications of a different régime in matters of accentuation are contained in the vowel changes which attend reduplication and composition. The reduplication and prepositional prefixes in Latin exercise an influence upon the vocalism of Latin roots which would remain unexplained, unless it be assumed that they once regularly received the accent. Thus, when *jūro* becomes in composition *pē-jēro*, *facio* becomes *\*cón-ficio*, *gnōtus* (with very old vocalism = Greek γνωτός = Sk. *jñātds*) becomes *có-gnītus*; it is necessary to assume that the accent stood originally upon the preposition at a time when the root-vowel was not as yet weakened (*\*pē-jūro*, *\*có-gnōtus*), and therefore accented in a manner thoroughly different from the laws of accent in historical times; for it would be incredible that this weakening of the root-vowel should take place under the summit-tone (*\*pē-jūro*, etc). This accentuation of the preposition with the finite forms of the verb inclining upon them is Indo-European, and at any rate an accentual condition which must be admitted for the Latin at some remote period. On the same principle *con-ficio* must have originated from a prehistoric *\*cón-facio*, with the accent on a syllable anterior to the antepenult. And, further, in the perfects, *tetigi*, *pepigi*, *cecini*, *fefelli*, *cecidi* (: *cado*), *cecidi* (: *caedo*), the weakening of the root-vowels is due to the accentuation of the reduplicating syllable; this leads to forms like *\*tētigimus*, etc., which again have the tone before the antepenult. Moreover, certain Italian forms not Latin support this view. E. g. the Oscan forms *fe-fāc-id* (perfect optative third singular), or *fe-fāc-ust* (future perfect third singular), when compared with Latin *con-fic-io*, or with an ideal reduplicated *\*fē-fic-i* from *\*fē-fāc-i*, show that this regular weakening of the root-syllables is a special Latin phenomenon; so also Umbrian *Jupater* is probably the common Italian predecessor of Latin *Jupiter*. If this weakening of the vowels, as would appear from such examples, is not common to all Italian dialects, but belongs especially to the Latin branch, and if it is assumed correctly that these weakenings would be impossible under an accent like *\*fefācust*, *\*fefācid*, we have an historical corroboration in actually occurring Italian words of the assumption that the three-syllable accent is a

... it possesses every law of the Latin ...  
... the tone within the last three syllables.  
... alone attempt to establish kinship  
... of the two languages? Therefore  
... of the Greek and Latin systems of  
... the weakest possible ground, and an  
... recessive accent which ignores the exter-  
... may now be approached with reasonable

VI

... the Greek recessive accent must start from  
... where alone it is evidently at home.  
... between the verb and the accent is not noticed  
... and has been pointed out above as the  
... stem. Yet the fact had been noticed and  
... ever by Götzling, who puts the verb on  
... the recessive accent in this respect. It is Wack-  
... the reason of his success that he began his  
... as the basis. And he has succeeded, as  
... explaining the Greek accent, as far as the  
... a series of qualities or laws of treatment to  
... subjected in *sentence-accent* in L. E. times,  
... recessive accent appears to be a development of  
... *sentence-accent* in distinction from *word-*  
... the start let the etymological accent of  
... latent, or better, keep in mind that the ety-  
... word may under certain circumstances vanish  
... of sentence-accentuation.

... with the observation that both in Greek and  
... verb is occasionally subjected to enclisis, of  
... possible differences in other respects. In  
... verb becomes enclitic under certain conditions  
... laws (see Whitney, Sk. Gramm. §592 fg.).  
... verbs in the present indicative, εἶμι and φημι,  
... explanation, according to which this enclisis  
... meaning, he rejects justly, because φημι is  
... He assumes, then, that this restriction of the

... being true that ΦΗΜΙ is, and continues to be, the  
... saying, often meaning 'aver,' 'asseverate,' and some-  
... a verb of swearing. λέγω in Homer is not yet a  
...

enclisis to these two indicatives is due to the Greek law of enclisis, according to which an enclitic word may not contain more than two syllables and three morae. This, it will be remembered, was exhibited in detail above, p. 42, where the examples *Zeús ἡμιν*, etc., with enclisis of the orthotone *ἡμῖν*, was shown to be the substitute of the enclisis which is exhibited in *Zeús μοι*. Of course these are not the only individual Greek finite verbal forms which, in spite of this restriction to three morae, could be inclined, but here Wackernagel recognizes with consummate acuteness that the present indicatives of these roots represent the only cases in the language where the entire paradigm of the tense or mood would allow the enclisis throughout. A form like *λέγω, πείθε, ἦσαν* would by itself be capable of enclisis, but not *λέγομεν, λέγετε, πείθετε, ἦστην*; therefore enclisis could not sustain itself in the paradigms to which these words belong; on the other hand, the *undisturbed* capacity for enclisis of *εἶμι, (εἶ), ἐστί, ἐστον, ἐσμεν, ἐστε, εἰσι; φημι, (φῆς),<sup>1</sup> φησι, φατον, φαμεν, φατε, φασι*, without a single interloper that would be debarred from enclisis by containing too many morae, is the secret of the preservation of their enclisis. The test for other tense or mode-systems is easily made and will always bring up some form containing either more than two syllables or three morae. The enclisis of these two present indicatives is then identical with the enclisis in *Zeús μοι*.

The question now arises: What has happened to the other verbs which were debarred from enclisis by containing too many morae? Precisely the same treatment that has happened to an enclitic pronoun of too many morae. They were inclined as much as possible, in accordance with the principle exhibited in the change of orthotone *ἡμῖν* to enclitic *ἡμιν*, and orthotone *ἡμῶν* to enclitic *ἡμων*; just as *Zeús ἡμων* contains orthotone *ἡμῶν* changed to *ἡμιν*, just so does *Zeús δοίη* contain the prehistoric *δοιή* = Sk. *deyāt*; however, not in its orthotone, but in its enclitic form, for *δοίη* is the enclitic to *\*δοιή* just as much as *ἡμων* is the enclitic of *ἡμῶν*. This may be formulated in the following proportion:

$$\text{Zeús μοι} : \text{Zeús ἡμων} = \text{Zeús ἐστί} : \text{Zeús δοίη}.$$

The recession of the Greek accent in the finite verb is accordingly everywhere not due to a process of accentual change within the word, but to a secondary accentuation which is a substitute for enclisis. It is false, therefore, to compare directly the accent of

<sup>1</sup> *El* and *φῆς* will be discussed further on.

1. Thus,  
*leyal*, but  
*blawind*,  
the verb

has over-  
aw which  
§591 fig.  
- *clauses*,  
: verb in  
use, etc.,  
otten and  
sisis, and  
tire finite

ded as a  
articiples  
ect regu-  
ve there-  
ed, even  
r relation  
e accent.  
*ur, ric de*  
*quar*; so  
thematic  
ssession  
nner the  
xplained.  
(written  
on the

the Sans-  
E. speech  
rogramme  
ie entitled  
en we see  
pon every  
ze in this  
nnant of  
132, note).  
aking his  
re sugges-

other hand, here again the forms which are not enclitic when uncompounded retain their accent, and the preposition loses its accent both in Greek and Sanskrit, ὑπολαβών, ἐπιών; in the same manner κάθηται and κατάκειται, but καθῆσθαι, κατακεῖσθαι, cf. Whitney, Sk. Gramm. §1083.

Wackernagel turns next to the second persons εἶ and φῆς, which are orthotone, and would endanger his entire explanation unless their orthotonesis is explained. The explanation which is proposed is a totally different one in each case.

For εἶ an etymological explanation is attempted. This word is Attic and Ionic, but post-Homeric; it is a form, then, which is later than the period in which the enclisis of the verb was fixed. Possibly it may be restricted even to Attic alone, inasmuch as it has been removed by Stein from Herodotus.<sup>1</sup> In order to explain this late and contracted εἶ, Wackernagel assumes that it is a middle form \*ἔσεσαι to ἔσομαι. Such a word, containing as it does three syllables, would, owing to the limitations of enclisis, not become toneless, but would appear with recessive accent as a substitute for enclisis in the usual way, and this \*ἔ(σ)ε(σ)αι, \*ἔεαι would then contract to εἶ, as \*ποιέ(γ)ε(σ)αι, ποιέεαι becomes ποιεῖ. But there are at least two objections to this explanation. First, the natural explanation of εἶ, which seems to be almost unimpugnable, is a totally different one. The word, whether restricted to Attic or not, is evidently old; it is \*ἔσι = Sk. *dsi* = Zd. *aḥi* = Goth. *is* = Lithuanian *esi* and Old Bulgarian *j-esi*;<sup>2</sup> the assumption of a ground-form \*ἔσεσαι is therefore unnecessary and improbable. Secondly, Wackernagel has assumed with indubitable success that within one tense-system, forms which by themselves could have been enclitic became recessive by the attraction of the rest of the system; why has not the analogy of the enclitics in the paradigm of εἶμυ succeeded in overcoming this single recessive example in its turn? It seems therefore much more probable that the lack of enclisis in εἶ is due to the influence of contracted forms in general. At the time when \*ἔ(σ)ι contracted to εἶ, other contractions taking place at the same

<sup>1</sup>According to Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, Stein and Abicht read *ελς*, while Becker and Dindorf read *εἶ*.

<sup>2</sup>The Indo-European form of the second person singular was \**esi*, e. g. the two *s*'s coming together from the root *es* plus the *-si* of the second person singular were simplified into a single *s* by some I. E. law of sound, before the separate existence of the languages of the family. Neither in Greek nor in Sanskrit would the theoretical \**essi* lose one of its *s*'s. For the Sanskrit, see Whitney, Sk. Gramm. §166.

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the situation.

2. Once the problem is identified, the next step is to analyze the situation and determine the root cause of the problem. This may involve conducting research, consulting with experts, or using analytical tools.

3. After the root cause has been identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This plan should outline the steps that need to be taken to address the problem and achieve the desired outcome.

4. The final step in the process is to implement the plan and monitor the results. This involves putting the plan into action and tracking progress to ensure that the problem is being effectively addressed.

[illegible]

by Vedic analogies. The word *φῆς* occurs in these 18 passages in the first one of two paratactic clauses, *e. g.* Plato Gorg. 491 B, *σὺ μὲν γὰρ φῆς . . . ἐγὼ δὲ σοῦ τούναντίον*. Compare with this Whitney, §596: 'The verb of a prior (principal) clause is not infrequently accented in antithetical construction. Sometimes the relation of the two clauses is readily capable of being regarded as that of protasis and apodosis; but often such a relation is very indistinct.'<sup>1</sup> Of course the Greek example comes under the head of antithetical construction; in the same manner the other 17 examples of Plato, etc., are readily disposed of. It seems that Wackernagel has beyond peradventure pointed out the correct reason for the peculiarly isolated position of the word *φῆς* in accordance with the rules of Vedic and Indo-European accentuation.

He turns further to various minor specialties of the recessive and enclitic accent, and explains them again in accordance with well-known laws of Vedic accent. Only the most interesting of these, the orthotonesis of *ἔστι*, will be mentioned. The older Greek grammarians, according to Lehrs, *Quaestiones epicae*, p. 126, know of no functional difference between *ἔστι* and *ἐστι*, but teach that the orthotone word stands at the beginning of the sentence and where certain particles, etc., immediately precede the word. According to some, only *οὐ* has this effect; according to others *οὐ*, *καί* and *ὥς*; *εἰ*, *ἀλλά*, and *τοῦτο* are also added by a few. With the exception of *τοῦτο* these words are either too weak to allow inclination upon them, or, like *καί*, are not real members of the sentence which they introduce, so that the *ἔστι* which follows stands in reality at the beginning of the sentence. This peculiarity is again explained by a rule in Whitney's *Sk. Grammar*, §593, 'The verb of a principal clause is accented when it stands at the beginning of the clause,' *e. g.* *syāma id índrasya çármaṇi*, 'may we be in Indra's protection.'

Other details of Greek accentuation, which need not be repeated here, are successfully explained, and everywhere Wackernagel's results are strictly in accordance with the principles which have been stated above for all kinds of phonetic investigation, and they are themselves new proof of the success of such investigations when carried on with these principles. In the first place every line of his investigation is permeated with the thought that it is not allowable to discuss the accent of the separate I. E. language without

<sup>1</sup>*E. g.* *prá-prā 'nyé ydnti, páry anyá āsate*: 'some go on and on, others sit about.'



taking for a basis the reconstructed I. E. accent. Further, this I. E. accent could only change by regular phonetic law or by analogy. Both factors are shown to have been at work. The phonetic law is the Greek law of enclisis by which real historical enclitics appear accented, though in manner clearly enough a mere compensation for enclisis; the reason for this phonetic law lies within the province of phonetics just as, *e. g.* the rhotacism which changes in so many languages an *s* to an *r*.

The workings of analogy we saw in many ways; above all this, that the enclitic character of the verb in principal clauses has been extended to the verb in subordinate clauses. It would be interesting in this connection to count the number of principal and subordinate clauses in Homer; no doubt the principal clauses would preponderate, as they most certainly do in the Rig-Veda. Wackernagel is the first one who has clearly established any kind of law as regards the sentence-accent of the I. E. languages, the leading fact being the enclisis of the finite verb in principal clauses. His results prove completely the fact that the study of accent cannot be carried on from the point of view of the word alone, but that it must also consider the larger speech unit, the sentence, and perhaps ultimately also the smaller, the syllable.

Wackernagel does not carry his results beyond the finite verb, but he leaves no room for doubt that the nominal accent in Greek, so far as it is not archaic and etymological, is enclitic and recessive. No doubt the noun has to a large extent followed the verb in its enclisis; the Vedic accent leaves us here almost entirely, but yet not altogether. In the Veda the vocatives are accented only when they stand at the beginning of a sentence, or clause, or verse, elsewhere they also are enclitic; see Whitney, *Sk. Gramm.* §314, and Haskell in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XI, p. 57 fg. Further, an adjective or genitive qualifying a noun in the vocative constitutes as far as accent is concerned a unity with it. Thus there arises in the case of a vocative in the middle of a clause a group of two or three, sometimes even more, unaccented nouns, cf. above, p. 31, note 2. The quantity of enclitic vocative material cannot have been very great at any period in any language of the family, yet it may have at least helped on the analogy of the verb in its inroads upon the noun. Possibly future investigations may succeed in pointing out the details of this process in an acceptable manner.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

### III.—ETYMOLOGICAL STUDIES.

#### II.

##### *Liceo, liceor.*

These words are generally brought together on the supposition that the first is used as the *passive* of the second. This supposition I hope to show is mistaken.

To begin with, it is most improbable that the relations between active and passive forms should be so entirely reversed and the consciousness of those relations so entirely destroyed that the same word should exhibit the *active* relation expressed by the *passive* form and the *passive* relation expressed by the *active* form. It has not been observed in discussing these words that, where the *same* voice has been adopted to express both the active and the passive side of an action, the verbs so used either come from different roots or else are differentiated in form. Thus we have :

*Active* : δράν or ποιεῖν ; βάλλειν ; λέγειν ; verberare.

*Passive* : πάσχειν ; πίπτειν ; κλύειν, ἀκούειν ; vapulare.

On the other hand, *iacēre*, *iacēre* ; *pendēre*, *pendēre*, &c., cf. Curt. Gr. Et.<sup>1</sup> No. 625.

This strong *prima facie* probability against connecting these two words is strengthened by an examination of their usages.

First, if we are to assume that these two words have reversed the active and passive functions in this most extraordinary manner, we ought at least to be able to find some traces of the reversal. If we cannot discover an active use of *liceo*, the frequent use of deponent verbs in the passive at least entitles us to expect a passive employment of *liceor*. Now (1) *liceo* is said to be used in an *active* sense. But of the instances that can be cited, Mart. 6, 66, 4 rests on a sheer blunder, Diomedes 398, 25 is wholly indecisive, and the sole evidence remaining is Plin. N. H. 35, 10, 36, § 83, percontanti quanti liceret opera effecta parvum nescio quid dixerat, where *licerent* for *liceret* is an easy and probable correction, already proposed by Sillig.<sup>1</sup> Even if this doubtful sentence be admitted, it will be no evidence for writers of greater antiquity and fewer pecu-

<sup>1</sup> I may add that I have investigated the whole lexicology of *liceo* and *liceor* in the Journal of Philology, (English), Vol. XI, p. 332.

liarities than Pliny; and the active use of *liceo* may with justice be regarded as a later development, owing to *liceo* being thought a more rational form than *liceor* to express '*I put a price on.*' (2) *Liceor* is never used in a passive sense. In the second place there is a marked difference in the meaning: *licere* is 'to be knocked down,' the result of the bidding; *liceri* is simply to bid, to offer. So long as *liceri* is going on, *licere* is impossible, so that the one cannot possibly be the active side of the other. To take two examples of *licere*. 'Omnia venibunt quique licebunt,' Plaut. Menaechm. 5, 9, 97, is 'everything will be sold to the highest bidder,' or 'for what it will fetch.' So Cic. Att. 12, 23, 5, quanti licuisse tu scribis, (if not from *licet*) means 'what they fetched.' So even in Pliny *l. c.*, quanti liceret is 'what price he would put on them,' or, in other words, 'what was the final, the selling price,' not what he would bid for them; and Mart. 6, 66, 4, parvo cum pretio diu liceret, 'when the price stuck for a long time at a trifle,' 'when all he could get for her was a small price.' *Licere* in fact is used of the final offer that concludes the sale or bargaining;<sup>1</sup> *liceri* of any bid, as I need not adduce passages to show.

What then are the two distinct roots from which *liceo* and *liceor* come?

Curtius *l. c.* has given that of *liceo*. He compares it with *licet*, Greek λείπειν and Sanskrit *ric'*. So that *licet res tanti* will mean 'an article is left, the bidding leaves off at a certain amount,'<sup>2</sup> *tanti* being a locative; see Roby, Lat. Grammar, Vol. II, § 1186, and compare the use of *stare*, *constare*.

Corssen<sup>3</sup> supposes the root of *liceor* to be RIK, reach out. It is seen in *por-ric-ere*, etc., *pol-lic-eri*; Old High Germ. *reihhan*, Goth. *leihwan*, O. H. G. *lihan*, Germ. *leihen*, Eng. *lend*. And an examination of the original meaning of the German *bieten*, to bid, which was to hold out, as in *beut den Finger*, Keisersberg, inclines me to believe that this suggestion is probably the true one. The persistence of the middle form *liceri* in the sense 'to reach out' is very noticeable. Compare in Latin *polliceri*, *licitari*,

<sup>1</sup> In other words *licere* is the result of the *licitatio maxima*, Suet. Cal. 22: compare the passage quoted below from the Digest.

<sup>2</sup> The meaning and derivation of *licere* are well illustrated by Paul. Dig. 10, 3, 19, penes quem licitatio remansit. Another conjecture may be hazarded. The personal use of *licere* may be a development of the impersonal. The auctioneer may have said *licet*, 'you can have it,' when he knocked it down; then the article itself was said *licere*. So pretty nearly Curtius Gr. Et.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> I<sup>2</sup> 500.

which seems generally to mean 'to *reach* or *lunge* with a weapon' in fighting, and in Greek ὀρέγεσθαι, and for the usage *digito liceri* the Homeric χερσὶν ὀρέξασθαι.<sup>1</sup>

From the same root RIK come besides *pol-lex* the thumb as standing out from the rest of the hand; and not improbably *pol-ling-o*, to *lay* or stretch out a corpse for burial, and *pol-linc-tor* an undertaker.

### *Trio, Septemtriones.*

These words have been discussed by Prof. Max Müller.<sup>2</sup> In his discussion there are some points to which exception must be taken.

The first of these is his summary treatment of Varro's authority. Varro says 'triones enim boves appellantur a bubulcis etiamnunc, maxime quom arant,' etc. On this passage Prof. Max Müller observes: "As a matter of fact *trio* is never used in this sense except once by Varro for the purpose of an etymology"—this is a gratuitous insinuation—"nor are the seven stars ever spoken of elsewhere as the seven oxen, but only as the oxen and shaft—*boves et temo*—a much more appropriate name." It is not likely that any one will follow Max Müller in attributing fraud to Varro, and in a matter like this it is impossible that he should be *mistaken*, especially when he speaks with so much circumstantiality—*a bubulcis—etiamnunc—maxime quom arant terram*. Max Müller's reasons are of the lightest. His argument from the fact of *trio* not occurring in this sense elsewhere would put in jeopardy all ἀπαξ λεγόμενα; and his appeal to 'appropriateness' is not more convincing. Different views are held by different persons about the appropriate, and 'the seven oxen' seems as appropriate a name for seven stars as, say, κύων *Canicula* is for one star. Accepting Varro's testimony means rejecting Max Müller's etymology, which indeed is improbable enough in itself. He derives *trio* from an uncertified form †*strio*† which he supposes to be an extinct Latin word for a 'star.' But not only the word but also the root, with which he connects it, STRI for STAR are devoid of authority.

We must start then with the form *trio* and the meaning 'ox' and look for some more satisfactory derivation. Max Müller,

<sup>1</sup> *Licitari machaera*, Caecil. ap Non. 134, 16 = ἐγχει ὀρέξασθαι, Hom. Il. 4, 307, etc. Cf. *licitator* gladiator, apparitor, occisor cui multa licent (!) Gl. Isid. (Ducange).

<sup>2</sup> *Science of Language*, Series II, p. 804 and foll.

though preferring his †*striot*†, has suggested that it comes from the root TRI, rub, crush, another or a cognate form of TAR in *tero*, *tritus*, τρι-β-ω, etc., the oxen, I suppose, being regarded as *crushing the clods*. This derivation is phonetically unexceptionable; but it seems to be a somewhat artificial way of naming the ploughing oxen. At all events I think I can suggest a better.

Two words throw considerable light on *trio* by the phonetic changes which they evidence; they are *lien* and *via*. *Lien* is for (sp)li(gh)en, original form SPLAGHAN<sup>1</sup>; it thus shows a weakening of *A* to *i* and a loss of GH. Precisely the same changes are shown in *via*, a word which has not had its rights from philologists.<sup>2</sup> *Via* is for *vigh-a* from root VAGH carry in *veho*, etc. It is formed straight from the root, like the Goth. *vig-s*, and not from a form *veh-ya* with suffix *ya*. For the *y* which only appears to disappear is by no means necessary to explain the *i*, and the Oscan *veia*, carriage, is no evidence for the Latin.

*Trio* then is for \**triho* \**trigho* from root TRAGH in *traho* *trag-ulum* = Eng. *drag*. It means 'the *drawer* of the plough, etc.,' the *o.r.*, especially when engaged in the act of drawing it (maxime quom arant terram). The suffix *-on* is frequently used of persons or things regarded as repeatedly performing an action.<sup>3</sup> Compare *palpo*, *combibo*, *calcitro*, etc.; and *trio*, like all these, is closely connected with a verbal stem (*trah*).

*Snidns*, *snidnm*, *seresco*, *serenus*, σερεινος.

The first of these words, *snidns*, is from a root SUR SVAR, shine, burn, which we see in Sansk. *svar* heaven, root *sur* shine, rule, Gr. Σερεινος, Lat. *ser-e-nus*, *Seracte*. If so, it will be for *serinas*. The loss of *r* before consonants is discussed by Corssen. In this case, as in that of *perd-o* = Gr. περδο it is partly due, I think, to an endeavor to avoid confusion. It was felt that *ser-e-nus*, bright, should be differentiated off from *surdus*, deaf, just as *perd-o*, *perdo*, from *perd-o*, *perdo*.

For the meaning 'bright, hot' see Virg. *Aen.* 8, 528, arma inter nubem caeli regione *serena* per *serena* rutilare vident, and Non. p. 507, *serena* dicitur *serena* unde et Tyberianus ait 'aureos subducent ignes *serena* et lucifer.' From the sense of 'burning, heating' we easily get that of 'drying.' In Latin *seresco* shows this

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Na. 300

<sup>2</sup> E. g. from Corssen I 460.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Roby Lat. Gr. I. 381

<sup>4</sup> Philoninus A. D. 400, Ptolemy Rom. I. 1 (Pto. Tr. I. 1 300)

sense most clearly; but it enters into *sudus* and *serenus* too. This is what makes *pelago sereno* (Virg. Aen. 5, 870) such an odd expression. With this 'dry sea' may be contrasted Statius' thoroughly appreciative use of the word, Ach. 1, 120, *properatque dapes largoque serenat igne domum*. The sense of 'drying' is perhaps preserved in Anglo-Sax. *sedrian*, dry, sere, Old High Germ. *sôrên*, dry up.<sup>1</sup>

The general sense of reducing volume by heat probably appears in *σίπαιον* for *σφιπ-αιον* which is used in the same sense as the Latin *defrutum*; unless indeed the name has reference to the bright look of the liquor. In this case the Sanskrit *surā*, wine, vinous liquor, but also *water*, may be compared.

Αὐτός.

Are we *obliged* to derive this word from a colorless pronominal root as Curtius does?<sup>2</sup> Is it not better to take it from the root AV to breathe, which we find in *ἄω* (*ἄφω*) Skt. root *vā* blow, Latin *ventus* = Eng. *wind*, etc?<sup>3</sup> It will then mean the 'living, breathing' man *himself*.

For the superlative suffix *ta* as in *ἰπ-α-το-ς*, etc., compare the German *selb-st* by the side of *selb-er*, Eng. *self*, and the Plautine *ipsissimus*. For the transference of meaning compare the Sanskrit *ātman*, *breath*, used in the oblique cases for 'self,' and the Hebrew *nefesh*, *breath*. This representation of a difficult and complex abstract idea by an analogy from the concrete world may be illustrated by other examples. Eng. *self*, Germ. *selb-* has been compared with M. H. G. *sin lîp* (*leib*), his *body*.<sup>4</sup> Hebr. *étsem*, *self* (originally of things and then of persons), meant properly 'bone.' So *gerem* in later Hebrew. In Dinda, a language of Central Africa, *yi guop* is *yourself* (lit. your body).<sup>5</sup> If the original meaning was such as we have described, the consciousness of it was lost very early, as we might expect. Compare Hom. Il. 1, 3, 4, *πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἀΐδι προΐαψεν ἥρώων· αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν*, which contrasts very curiously with Arist. Pol. V 6, 16, *αὐτούς τε . . . καὶ τὰ σώματα*.

<sup>1</sup> Taken by Curtius, No. 600 *b*. from a root SUS. Prof. Skeat has suggested to me that *sudus* for *su(s)dus* is from the same root. The possibility of this is not to be denied, though the other words point to a root SVAR.

<sup>2</sup> Curt.<sup>6</sup> 543 Eng. tr. II 161.

<sup>3</sup> Curt. No. 587.

<sup>4</sup> Grimm, Deutsch. Gramm. III, pp. 5, 647.

<sup>5</sup> Pott, W. Von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft, p. xx.





largest family of derivatives in the language and be as demonstrably an alien. In fact it does not matter at all how many words are *derived* from it, but whether any are *connected* with it. The fertility of a borrowed word is only a question of use and time. As soon as its strangeness has worn off and it is not distinguished by the linguistic consciousness from the rest of the language, it will resemble them in having derivatives. But however fertile it may be of offspring, it cannot 'beget ancestors' so to say. Philology will observe that only its descendants have any resemblance to it, and that they and it stand alone without other relations in the language, and will thus convict it of foreign extraction. This is true isolation, and the isolation of *bulbus*. I will illustrate apparent isolation from a single but very striking case, a word which, so far as I know, has not hitherto been derived.

*Egula* is a word once found in Pliny<sup>1</sup> as the name of a particular kind of sulphur. It is derived from root AGH to choke, which we see in Latin *ango*, Greek ἀγχω,<sup>2</sup> etc. It is the only word from the root AGH with an *e* in which the original physical meaning is preserved, *eg-ula* being the 'choking' or 'stifling' sulphur. In all the other cognate words *eg-enu-s* *eg-eo*, etc., which show the *e*, the meaning is the same as in the Greek ἀχὴν, viz. the 'res *angusta* domi,' the pinch of poverty.

### Γοργός.

This word, which is explained by Hesychius as ἐντραφής, is to be added to the derivatives of root GAR (Curt. No. 643.) It shows a mutilated reduplication and a meaning *fat*, big, which is often derived from that of 'feeding,' e. g. *ob-esu-s* by *edo*, τρώφει (Homer) by τρέφειν. And I see no reason why γοργός, fierce, grim, and γοργώ, should not be the same word in the active sense of 'devouring.'

### ὀίομαι, δίοω.

If we may trust Greek sound laws, this word has lost a spirant between the *o* and the *i*. As we have no other evidence as to what it was, we must at once resort to the meaning. The following usages in Homer are significant—(1) that of *anxiously expecting*, of being painfully intent on a thing: Od. 2, 351 κείνον δίομένη τὸν

<sup>1</sup> Pliny 35, 15, 50.

<sup>2</sup> Curtius No. 166 (a).



δύσμορον εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι; Il. 13, 283 ἐν δέ τέ οἱ κραδίη μεγάλα στέρνοισι πατάσσει κῆρας διομένω; Od. 10, 248 ἐν δέ οἱ ὅσσε δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο γόνυ δ' ὤϊετο θυμός. Again, (2) that of *ominous presaging*, Od. 9, 213 θυμός δις αὖτό μοι, and even impersonally, Od. 19, 312 ἀλλά μοι ὥδ' ἀνὰ θυμόν διέταί ὥς ἴσεται περ. (3) Lastly that of *sure conviction*, of *prophetic anticipation*, whether of something within or something without our own range of power, Il. 13, 262 οὐ γάρ οἶω πολεμίζειν, Il. 6, 341 κινήσεσθαι σε οἶω.

This *straining* and *watching*, this *fore-boding* and this *absolute conviction* and *confidence* of *prophecy* point us to the divining art. The word, so to speak, gives us a complete picture of the οἰωνοσκόπος in the various phases of his art. We see him waiting with straining eyes for the interpreters of heaven's will and trembling in a suspense of hope and fear. The message come, we hear the mysterious tones in which he announces destiny to the people, and we appreciate the confidence of prediction with which he meets and crushes all doubt and disbelief. So that it is not without reason that we find two glosses of Hesychius close together:

οἰωνεῖς· οἰήσεις δοκήσεις.

οἰονίζει· μαρτεύει.<sup>1</sup>

Accepting this clue, we shall take οἶω to be for οἰφίω and to be connected with the Latin *avi-s* and the Greek δ(F)ι-ωνό-s and to have meant originally to *consult the birds*: being related to \*οἰφίς, a bird, an obsolete Greek word, as μῆριω is to μῆνις. Nor shall we wonder that a word expressing confidence or conjecture about the future should have been derived from 'bird' when we recall passages like Aristoph. Av. 720 ἄντι τε νομίζετε πάνθ' ὅσα περ περὶ μαντείας διακρίνεται κ. τ. λ.; or that a word proper to the diviner's art should have become part of the common stock of the language when we think of the Latin *auspicari*, *augurari*, *dicinare*, *ominari*, *autumare*.

J. P. POSTGATE.

<sup>1</sup> The form in which M. Schmidt gives the first gloss (which, according to him, is corrupt in the MSS) is hardly satisfactory. If δοκῆσεις is a future, as it appears to be, we should emend οἰωνεῖς. [οἰωνεῖς may be for οἰωνεῖς and οἰονίζει for οἰωνεῖς. B. L. G.]

## NOTES.

### GRADIO, GRADIO; GRANDIVUS, GRADIVUS.

In Aulularia, vv. 48 and 49, we read:

Si hercle hódie fustem cépero aut stimulum ín manum  
Testúdineum istum tíbi ego grandibó gradum,

but BDEJ according to Goetz have *gradibo*. The passage is quoted by Nonius Marcellus, p. 115, 1, where the codices give *grandivo*. The connection with *grandire*<sup>1</sup> is of course undeniable, but the pun is much more effective if we read *grādibo gradum*, and it becomes a question which none of the editors seems to have entertained, whether the spelling of the MSS. ought not to be kept. Plautus seems to be fond of puns where there is a difference of quantity in the vowels of the words played upon. To cite but a few examples, Amph. 318 *exössatum ōs*, 342 *ōs exössas*; Bacch. 362 *Crūcisalum—Crūsalo*, 687 *crūciatum Crūsalum*; Mil. 325 *lūdo lūto*, 1425 *míttis—mītis*; Merc. 82 *āmens āmans*, 643 *mālis—mālum*; Rud. 1225 *licet—infelīcet—licentia*.

That *n* had a weak sound and a tendency to disappear before certain consonants is a well-known fact. Some interesting remarks on this phenomenon by Buecheler may be found in a recent number of the *Rheinisches Museum*, Bd. 37, 1882, pp. 525-9. The disappearance is most frequent before *s*, but occurs also before gutturals and dentals. It may be well here to give more fully some facts relative to the tradition of the Plautus MSS. in this particular.

According to Rassow, *de Plauti Substantivis*, *pollictor* for *pollinctor* occurs Poen. Prol. 63 (Codd. *pollector*, Fulgentius *pollinctor*), and Asin. 910 (*pollictozem* B'DJ, *pollictoze* E). Nonius has *pollinctorem*, keeping the nasal as in the case of *grandibo* (Aul. 49), and he is followed by Goetz and Loewe in their edition of 1881. In Asin. 276 the same editors follow BDEJ in leaving out the *n* of *praegnatis*. In Aul. 163 BDEJ have *pregnantem*, and Goetz reads *praegnantem*. In Amph. 723 B has *pregnati*, which Goetz and Loewe adopt against *pregnanti* of DJ. Truc. 390 Schoell reads with A and B

<sup>1</sup> The adjective *grandis* is found associated with *gradus* in the following passages: Curc. 118, *grandiorem gradum*; Truc. 286, *grandi gradu*; Epid. 13, *gradibus grandibus*; Pacuvius 37, *praegrandi gradu*.



To the derivation of *Grādivus* from *grādiōr* the quantity offers a serious objection. As the dictionaries give no fair idea of the frequency with which the word occurs, I give the following statistics. The following poets always have *Grādivus*; after each name I add the number of occurrences,<sup>1</sup> Statius (20), Claudian (9), Juvenal (2), Seneca (2), Vergil (2), Lucan (1). *Grādivus* occurs six times in Ovid, five times in Valerius Flaccus, and twice in Silius Italicus. I give the verses where *Grādivus* occurs:

Ovid, Met. VI 427, Et genus a magno ducentem forte Gradivo,

Val. Flac. V 651, Rumperet irridens strepitumque minasque Gradivi:

Sil. It. XV 15, Qui consulta ducum ac flagret meliore Gradivo

XV 337, Moles illa viri, calidoque habitata Gradivo

It will thus be seen that *Grādivus* only occurs at the end of an hexameter, while there are forty-nine examples of *Grādivus*.

The verb *grandire* is used of the growth of plants. So Nonius, p. 115, explains *grandire* as *grandem facere*, and cites from Varro, "Quum aut humus semina concipere non possit, aut recepta non reddat, aut edita grandire nequeat," from Attius a similar use of *pergrandescere*, "*Fruges prohibet pergrandescere*." For *grandire* used as a neuter, the dictionaries cite Cato, R. R. 141, 2. As this passage, in connection with the Aulularia verse above discussed, first suggested to me the possibility of *gradivus* being derived from *grandire*, I will give it in full. It is a formal prayer to Mars. "Mars pater, te precor, quaesoque uti sies volens propitius mihi, domo, familiaeque nostrae quouis rei ergo agrum terram, fundumque meum suovetaurilia circumagi iussi, ut tu morbos visos invisosque, viduertatem, vastitudinemque calamitates intemperiasque prohibeas, defendas averruncesque. Utique tu *fruges, frumenta vineta virgultaque grandire* beneque evenire sinas, pastores, pecuaque salva servassis, duique bonam salutem valetudinemque mihi, domo, familiaeque nostrae." Now, as we have from the verb *averruncare* *Averruncus*, i. e. an averting deity, so from *grandire* we have *Gra(n)divus*, a deity promoting growth. Preller, Römische Mythologie, I, p. 340, has the following note: "Auch der Deus Averruncus bei Varro VII 102, Gellius V 12, 14, ist höchst wahrscheinlich Mars." It seems to me evident that in Aen. III 35 f. Mars is invoked in both capacities as *Gra(n)divus* presiding over the growth of *virgulta* (cf. v. 23), and *Averruncus*, averting threat-

<sup>1</sup> I have looked up the passages according to the best accessible indices. Harpers' cites but one case of *Grādivus*.



sound heard in the first syllable of *Gradivus*. *Gram'ndivus* pronounced with the *e* slurred would not be unlike *Grādivus*. If the view above set forth of the origin of *Gradivus* is accepted, and if *gradibo* is received in Aul. 49, it would follow that the *a* of *grandis* is long by nature. Were it short, it would remain so after the extrusion of the *n*, cf. *Tarētinas*, Καλεῖδας. As to the etymology of *grandis* itself, whether it has any connection with Ags. greát, Ahd. grōz, Urdeutsch \*grauts, as Johannes Schmidt with others assert, I do not feel competent to pass any judgment. The connection assumed by Vaniček of *grandis* with *gravis*, Skr. *gurú*, does not seem to me to be clearly established.

MINTON WARREN.

### THE BUCOLIC CAESURA.

In the *Hermathena*, No. VIII, Mr. Tyrrell follows Dr. Maguire in throwing doubt upon the commonly accepted theory of the bucolic caesura, summing up his conclusion as follows: "The only expression of the rule, as far as I know, which really colligates the phenomena is that of Dr. Maguire, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and it runs thus: 'When the fourth foot ends with a word, the fourth foot must be a dactyl, *if there is a stop after the fourth foot.*'"

Mr. Tyrrell mentions Marius Victorinus and Terentianus Maurus as the authorities for the existing rule, but he does not quote them, nor does he allude to a passage in Servius, which to my mind is very important as setting the matter in its true light. Before considering what is the real import of the ancient grammarians' testimony, it will be convenient to quote them in full.

Servius on Eclogue 1 init. Carmen bucolicum, quod debet quarto pede terminare partem orationis. Qui pes si sit dactylus, meliorem efficit versum; ut 'nos patriae fines et dulcia.' Primus etiam pes secundum Donatum dactylus esse debet, et terminare partem orationis; ut 'Tityre.' Quam legem Theocritus vehementer observat, Vergilius non adeo. The Pseudo-Probus gives the rule in a much shorter form.

Terentianus Maurus, p. 389 (Keil):

Pastorale volet cum quis componere carmen,  
tetrametrum absolvat, cui portio demitur ima,  
quae solido a verbo poterit conectere versum.  
bucolicon siquidem talem voluere vocari.



## ON A TRANSPOSITION IN SENECA.

The method which I recently applied to the case of a transposed passage in the New Testament has an interesting illustration in Seneca, ad Marciam. Madvig (*Adversaria Critica*, p. 355) pointed out that two passages had been transposed in c. 17, and that the words "Dicit omnibus nobis natura . . . qui tibi nihil certi spoponderunt" (c. 17, 6, 7) should in reality stand after the words "sed humanum est" (c. 17, 1). Almost all such cases of transposition arise from the misplacement of a sheet or sheets in the MS or papyrus roll of which they form a part. And it follows at once that in all such errors we must have an integral number of pages for each of the two passages concerned in the transposition, and also an integral number of pages for the portion of the book antecedent to the disputed ground. Let us apply this test to the passages of Seneca just referred to.

Taking the Teubner edition as our standard, we have to carry a passage 12.6 Teubner lines in length to a place 38 lines earlier. Obviously 38 is  $12.6 \times 3$  very nearly. Assuming 12.6 lines to represent a single page of the manuscript, the space through which it has to be moved is three pages. The previous part of the book is 568 lines =  $45.0 \times 12.6$  very nearly.

The error, therefore, arose at the 46th page of the MS, and consisted in placing the 47th page after the 50th. Madvig's criticism is therefore completely confirmed.

In the next place, we may enquire into the stichometric size of the page in question. The average Teubner line being found to be 46.9 letters, or somewhat less, and the average hexameter being about 36 letters, a page of 12.6 Teubner lines is about 16 hexameters.

Finally, the remainder of the book being reckoned, we have for the MS in which the error was made a roll of very nearly 83 complete pages.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

---

"IS BEING BUILT."

The earliest examples of the use of our passive progressive form, *is being built*, etc., that have thus far been noted, date from 1769-79; see Dr. F. Hall's *Adjectives in Able*, also *English Rational and Irrational*, *Nineteenth Century*, Sept. 1880, by the



\_\_\_\_\_

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th inst. and in reply to inform you that I have the pleasure to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,  
 Yours, Sir, very obediently,  
 J. H. [Signature]

### 三、Summary

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Französische Studien. Herausgegeben von G. KÖRTING und E. KOSCHWITZ.  
III Band, 3 Heft. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Die Wortstellung in der altfranzösischen Dichtung "Aucassin et Nicolette,"  
von Julius Schlickum.

Prof. Suchier's edition of the Aucassin et Nicolette text, Paderborn, 1881, is taken for this special study, and in the arrangement of the material for it the reader will find much that reminds him of Morf's paper, Die Wortstellung im altfranzösischen Rolandsliede, Roman. Studien, Band III, S. 199-294. A short review of the Suchier edition of A. and N. was given in this Journal, Vol. II, pp. 234-36, in which mention was made of the great importance of this work, both for the study of the morphology and the syntax of Old French, and especially for the latter, as its peculiar form—the *Chantefable*, a mixture of prose and poetry—enables us to examine these two species of sentence as given by one and the same author. This advantage is manifest from the outset where we find differences between the poetic and prose construction, and where the former frequently prefers a certain set form varying from the normal one simply to produce by it some psychological or rhetorical effect. Metre and assonance come in here also as important elements to cause the poet to change the position of his words. This is seen particularly in Old French, where, in the relation of object to verb, the strictest rules of syntax are overthrown, while in the modern language this relation is subject to fixed and rigid law for both poetry and prose.

If we take the simplest phrase-elements—subject, verb, object—whose relations to one another are treated by the author in the various kinds of sentence—declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory—we find deviations of usage from certain other models of the Old French literature that are at once striking and instructive, and which, when compared with the canons of modern syntax, show strong tendencies to a development of the present inflexible system. For instance, though there is still a certain freedom with reference to the order of subject and object, yet the predominant tendency is found to be in the direction of the rigid law of the modern language where the subject is required to precede the verb. The writer finds 312 sentences of this kind to only 70 with other positions, thus showing how this expression of the logical sequence of ideas had gained the upper hand in the early period of the language. Inversion is not arbitrary, as Diez and Mätzner have maintained, but subject to fixed laws that scarcely know exception. These results compared with compositions of a century earlier, *e. g.* the Chanson de Roland at the end of the XI century, present a striking contrast, in that the latter gives us numerous exceptions to its rule of inversion. Here, with *verba dicendi*, inversion of the subject was regular, and this is also found to be the case for the most part in the poetic



should also have been drawn upon largely to show the general character of many of the sentence-forms; but this is not done, nor is there scarcely even a reference to the Latin construction, which, in certain cases, would have illustrated the force of a given order of words much more clearly than any possible explanation according to general principles. On the whole, this little pamphlet may be used with advantage by those studying the text for the first time, and it forms an important factor in the line of special syntactical studies which must be the basis for any future general syntax of Old French.

#### 4 Heft.

In Vol. III, p. 434 sqq., the editor of this Journal, in his "Studies in Pindaric Syntax," designates the four principal forms of the Conditional Sentence which the Greek holds sharply apart as 'logical,' 'anticipatory,' 'ideal,' and 'unreal.' The second of these, the 'anticipatory'—*ἐάν τι ἔχωμεν, δώσομεν*—was turned over by the Latin from the region of objective possibility into that of reality ('logical') and both represented by the indicative, thus reducing the number of its leading conditional forms to three. For the two remaining Greek species, the 'ideal' and the 'unreal,' the Latin kept its own peculiar mode of treatment with a clear distinction of mood and tense in each. In the 'ideal' type where the Greek has *εἰ* with the optative in the protasis, and optative with *ἄν* in the apodosis, the Latin uses the subjunctive (pres. or perf.) in both clauses (*Haec si tecum patria loquatur nonne impetrare debeat; Si me suspendam, meam operam luserim*), while in the 'unreal' condition—the hypothesis contrary to fact—it employs a past tense of the subjunctive to express the double point of view of present and past time. For the domain of the present the imperf. stands in both clauses (*sapientia non expeteretur, si nihil efficeret* = *εἰ τι εἶχον, ἐδίδοον ἄν*); for that of the past, the pluperfect (*si voluisset, dimicasset* = *εἰ τι ἔσχεον, ἔδωκα ἄν*).

In the representation of these phases of the 'unreal' condition, Modern French syntax presents a striking contrast with the Latin by the use of the indicative imperf. in the protasis and the imperfect future (conditional) in the apodosis (*Je le ferais encore, si j'avais à le faire*—Corneille) for present time, and the pluperfect indicative and pluperfect future (*si . . . les législateurs avaient établi la cession des biens, on ne serait pas tombé dans tant de séditions*) for past time. This cutting loose from the traditions of the mother language and nearer approach to the Greek type of construction is most striking, and it is the chief merit of the paper before us—*Historische Entwicklung der syntaktischen Verhältnisse der Bedingungssätze im Altfranzösischen*, von Joseph Klapperich—to have followed up the traces of the Latin sentence construction in French, and to have shown, as might *a priori* have been expected, that this passage from the domain of subjective to that of objective representation of thought was not a process that took place suddenly.

Just as we saw a reduction in the number of conditional forms in passing from the Greek to the Latin, so the author of this treatise discovers that from the very earliest period of the French the 'anticipatory' had been merged into the 'logical' condition, which always takes the indicative, while the type of subjective possibility—the 'ideal' condition—has been pushed forward and, for the most part, identified with the 'unreal' condition. This leaves us, then,

only two leading species of conditional phrase for the modern language, viz. the 'logical' and the 'unreal,' instead of the three of the mother idiom. Of these two main sets of the hypothetical sentence, it is the first which is characterized by the almost exclusive use of the indicative present and future in the subordinate and principal members, respectively, of the phrase. The substitution of the future for the present in the protasis is very unusual, though we do find sporadic traces of it as far down as the XVI century, and it is doubtless to the Low Latin that we must look for the model, according to which, with time, the rigid Modern French rule was built up of excluding the future from the conditional member of a hypothetical clause. Draeger, in his *Hist. Syntax*, II, p. 286-8, notes the use of the present for the future in this case as a common phenomenon in the Folks Latin, and the usage has simply been confirmed by a further development of the modern syntax. The French here differs very materially from other members of the Romance group of languages which admit the future as the legitimate type of the protasis. *E. g.* Ital. Dante, *Inf.* I 121, *alle qua' poi se tu vorrai salire, anima fia a ciò di me più degna.* Port. Camões *Os Lusíadas*, IV 18, *Rei tendes tal, que se o valor tiverdes Igual ao Rei, que agora alcantastes, Desbaratareis tudo o que quizer des.* The same construction prevails in Spanish, while the Provençal, on the other hand, agrees with the French.

Very few examples are found by the writer where, according to the Latin arrangement (*in insidiis hic ero, si quid deficiat*), the subjunctive is used in the protasis of an 'ideal' condition, with the future in the apodosis.

For the 'unreal' condition the Old French used the imperfect subjunctive in both clauses, corresponding exactly to the Latin usage. In the earliest period of the language, however, this imperfect frequently represents the Latin pluperfect in meaning, from which it had taken its form, and as this construction prevails throughout the whole of the Old French period, it cannot be reckoned as a rare phenomenon as Mätzner does in his *Syntax*, I, p. 97. In fact its use is so common that it has usurped the legitimate field of the pluperfect subjunctive in both clauses of a conditional sentence, so that this latter . . . all in this capacity in the oldest texts. The oldest documents thing of the Modern French order, pluperfect in the protasis e (conditional) in the apodosis, of which the earliest examples e Wace's *Roman de Rou* of the second half of the XII century. , however, the pluperfect subjunctive held exclusive sway in n the condition bore upon past time, and it was not till a rent period that it split up into the Modern French type of bjunctive pluperfect in the subordinate clause. The subjunc- in such cases is now dying out, according to K.'s investigation, continuance in use so long from the fact that the compound ed here at an epoch when the conditional phrase that bore or future had already begun to go over to the Modern French his I hold to be, however, only a specious cause for its long reason for it lies in the conservative tendencies of the language hold fast to the old models of expression which we see strongly : exclusive use of the subjunctive element up to within a recent guage.

of the present and future, where the Old French characteristic ie imperfect subjunctive in both clauses, the modern form of

imperfect indicative in the protasis and imperfect future (conditional) in the apodosis appears at an early date. The first examples cited belong to the *Comput* of Philippe de Thaon—beginning of the XII century—and yet there are cases of a manifest tendency to it as far back as the *Chanson de Roland* (XI century), where in v. 1804, *Se veissum Rollant, ains qu'il fust morz, Ensembl' od lui i durriums granz colps*, the only variation from the modern type consists in the use of the imperfect subjunctive in place of the imperfect indicative in the protasis. This and other examples of similar construction prove beyond doubt that the emancipation from the Latin mould took place originally in the apodosis. This construction cited from the *Chanson de Roland* has died out in French, but it still lives in the other Romance languages, *e. g.* Ital. *s'egli venisse, lo troverebbe*; Spanish, *si yo le viese, se lo daria*. This is, then, the bridge by which we have passed from the Old French subjunctive in both clauses to the modern imperfect indicative + the future. From the beginning of the XII century this construction is constantly gaining ground, until towards the end of the same when it becomes the predominant type of hypothetical phrase for present and future time.

The modern construction with imperfect indicative in both clauses when the condition bears upon past time, is unknown in the earlier documents. Here, too, the principal clause became the transition link by which the present typical form was developed out of the old one.

The original Old French subjunctive-protasis lived on up into the XVI century, when it finally became folks style; and just as the subjunctive kept its place in the protasis longer than in the apodosis in the pure condition, so in hypothetical constructions with the comparative particles *comme* and *que*, the principal clause was the first to yield to the new conception of time relation and pass from the subjunctive to the indicative type.

In conditional relative phrases the writer finds the same construction prevailing as in the conditional with *si*, except that they do not entirely exclude the future from the subordinate clause.

Several other less important kinds of condition are examined in this interesting paper, the principal one of which is the hypothetical subordinate phrase used as a formula of conjuration. Diez' ellipsis theory is here stuck to by the writer in opposition to Bischoff, who, in his *Conjunctiv bei Crestien de Troies*, regards it as a mixture of two optative constructions. The *Roman de Rou* contains the first use of *se* in these formulas, *e. g.* II 670 *Gentils ber, dist li reis, Se Deus me beneie, Tus sui pres*.

In the sequence of two conditional subordinate clauses the omission of *se* in the second member is the common rule in Old French, and it was not till in the XV century that the modern law of substitution of *que* for *se* in this case became general; however, we do find occasional examples of it as far back as the middle of the XII century, *e. g.* Rou III 8943, *Et se Deus le velt consentir E que a lui vienge a plaisir, Bien le feron d'ore en avant*.

On the whole, I think this treatise, of sixty-five pages, altogether the most comprehensive and the best that has yet appeared for this department of syntax. The writer has evident control of his material for the Old French and gives us frequent references to the Latin, but as is usual with all such works very little account is taken of parallel or identical phenomena in the cognate languages. This lack is especially felt for certain phases of construction which at one



of which K. discerns in *Beowulf*); Edinburgh Review for Oct. 1845; W. Wagner's *Deutsche Heldensagen*, Leipzig, 1881. General references and discussions that elucidate particular points may be found in Weinhold's *Alt-nordisches Leben*, Wackerbarth's *Music and the Anglo-Saxons*, Bouterwek's *Caedmon*, Lappenberg's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*. It may be well too to mention Gräter's *Suhm's History of Denmark*, Baldwin's recent work on English Literature, Hammerich's *De episk-kristelige old-kvad hos de Gotiske folk* (Copenhagen, 1873), W. Grimm's *Die deutsche Heldensage*. The reference *sub* Lumsden, "Academy, Vol. XVIII," should be Academy, Vol. XIX; and read, in the next line, "by Wülcker in Anglia, *Anzeiger*, IV, 69."<sup>1</sup> It has not been possible for the reviewer to make exact references in every case, the volumes in question not being always at hand. Doubtless Dr. Garnett has many of them already on hand for a future edition.

The peculiar feature of this translation is its line-for-line literalness, with alliteration as an occasional grace. Undoubtedly such a theory must result in much distressing involution of phrase, which the translator has foreseen and done his best to overcome. As a translation for popular reading it fails precisely in this point. To the Anglo-Saxon scholar the involutions are quite intelligible, for he has grappled with them from the beginning of his studies in Anglo-Saxon poetry; but to the general reader they are obscure and tormenting enough. In so far then as the translation is an exact and faithful reproduction of the original addressed to students, it is a success; but in so far as it is intended to popularize a most difficult poem, it cannot be called such. It cannot be said, moreover, that the new version is perfectly free from those *Unwörter* with which Ettmüller's alliterative version was reproached; or from monotony, as the perpetual recurrence of such words as "victorious," "jewel," "treasure" (translating A. S. words in which a subtler insight would have perceived picturesque shades of meaning); or from inexactness here and there in the translation of particles (ll. 369, 182, *heoru* omitted; l. 735, *pa gen*, rather = "any longer" than "not yet"; l. 862, "now" for "nevertheless"; l. 1353, "unless" for "except"), or from neglect of certain points, as of the duals in several important passages (ll. 1707, 1783).

In other passages the translation is a distinct advance on Heyne's text, and throws light on obscure points, as ll. 1143-4, 1213-14, 2051, 2860-1. Ll. 2522-3 and 3117 take a liberty with the text (no notes explaining the variations). Umbrage might be taken at what appear to be verbal slips or inaccuracies, as l. 1861, "swan's bath" for "gannet's bath"; l. 236, "weighty words" for "words"; l. 293, "horse-thanes" for "kindred-thanes," "comrades"; l. 307, "went" for "went down"; l. 435, "renounce" for "scorn"; l. 498, "band" for "joy" (see Toller-Bosworth, 218, for numerous references, though this one is omitted); l. 1043, "of" for "over"; l. 1175, "would" for "wouldst"; l. 1191, "by" for "'twixt"; l. 1285: query: can *heoru bunden* mean "twisted sword"?; l. 1537, "cared she not for the contest" for "cared he," "shrank he," etc.?; l. 1616, "twisted" for "drawn"?; l. 1736, "sorrow" for "remorse"?; l. 1793, "pleased to rest" for "longed sorely to rest"?; l. 1943, "any dear man" for "leman"?; l. 1980, "with mighty words" for "with formal or courteous words"?; l. 2029, why "courtier"? In our opinion *oft* here belongs to *gesette*; *no* is wrong, and the trans-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bright.



lation is "seldom after a leader's fall rests the death-spear [even] a little while"; l. 2145, "by" should be omitted; l. 2175, "saddle-bright" for "bright-saddled" ?; l. 2299, "at times" is omitted; l. 2449, "with" for "through," "on account of"; l. 2576, "fearful" for "grisly-hued"; l. 2577, *in æge lǣfe* seems to mean "with the edge of the sword," not "with the *mighty* relic"; l. 2640, "thought of honors for us" for "exhorted us to deeds of glory"; l. 2750, "on account of" for "after seeing"; l. 2820, the ambiguous "doom of the saints" for "realm of the saints." Quotation marks have been omitted l. 687. Many of these corrections would naturally spoil the rhythm which, though rugged, is based throughout upon the consistent introduction of two accented words to each hemistich; but the translation would gain in accuracy.

In judging a work of this nature, however, one may easily be led to be over-censorious. The difficulty and corrupt state of the text must be kept carefully in view; the inadequacy of the lexical helps to a thorough study of Anglo-Saxon is another point to be remembered; and the still very imperfectly understood canons of A. S. poetic syntax may well admit a variety of translations in passages that seem at first perfectly clear. Dr. Garnett is modest in everything that he advances. Though his translation cannot be called poetry as, in some senses, the translations of Simrock, Heyne, Wackerbarth, Conybeare (partial) and Lumsden may be, it is rhythmical and vigorous, now and then felicitous in single epithets, now and then dramatic when it grapples with the memorable episodes. It is worthy of extended notice; it deserves, as it has received, the approbation of Prof. Child and Henry Sweet; and it need not fear the criticisms of church-mice or of academicians in a corner.

J. A. H.

---

ed with Introductory Dissertations, Critical Notes, Commentary on. By W. GUNION RUTHERFORD, A. M., of Balliol College, London: Macmillan & Co. 1883.

Rutherford's English reviewers, in a highly commendatory notice *Trynichus*, says that Mr. Rutherford 'has quite succeeded in ridding though somewhat aggressive dogmatism of style of Cobet's criticisms.' It is much to be feared that praise like this has encouraged Rutherford in his *παρρησία*, for his edition of Babrius is studded with marks which will certainly earn for the editor the close, if not censure of sundry Greek scholars. It is not pleasant to be told rather from want of knowledge and judgment than of native ability, that 'the abundance of [one's] work has given [one's] opportunity to which, if linguistic tact and careful scholarship are wanting, is little right' (p. 72 δ), that one 'has flaunted his ignorance' (p. 92 δ), that one shows 'his usual absence of appreciation of the Greek language' (p. 109 δ), that a certain form is 'a paltry conjecture it has been accepted by Liddell and Scott' (p. 121 α), that one's making conjectures is only equalled by one's boldness' (p. 125 α) when proposal is hardly a conjecture; it is a correction.' This is the case with many of the passages that have caught my eye in turning over the volume; they are more of the same order. This is not so bad as German

criticism at its worst, and there is perhaps too much deference both in England and in this country to official ignorance and incapacity, but Mr. Rutherford goes perhaps a trifle too far. But if he has shown somewhat more acerbity in this book than in the *New Phrynichus*, he has, on the other hand, tempered the fervor of his style, and the average philological mind will not be so much disturbed by his rhetoric as not to profit by the valuable work he has done for and about Babrius.

A sharp, clear knowledge of Attic Greek ought to be insisted on, not for the purpose of sneering at subsequent developments as so many morbid growths, but for the sake of getting into full sympathy with the finest type of the Greek mind; but in whatever spirit that sharp, clear knowledge of Attic Greek is promoted, we ought to rejoice even if we cannot agree with the temper of Cobet or his admirer, Mr. Rutherford. Later Greek when read with college students, if read at all, ought to be read with an incessant reference to the model language, and it is only from a sense of the usefulness of such a process that I gained my consent to edit the colorless and lumbering apologies of Justin Martyr. Indifference as to the period and the sphere of Greek vocabulary, Greek formations, Greek syntax, is one of the great evils with which an honest teacher of Greek has to contend, and this indifference is systematically encouraged by the scrappy readings of early youth; and I can almost forgive one of my own pupils who has steadily declined to teach anything but model Attic Greek, leaving the boys to pick up Homer as they would Chaucer in after years. Now Babrius is excellent practice for the exercise to which I have adverted, and I have often used his fables for the purpose of testing knowledge as to the history of Greek words, forms, syntactical rules. As a special student of the Greek verb, as the editor of *Phrynichus*, Mr. Rutherford has been able to do good in pointing out late forms and words of recent origin, but this has not been done systematically either in commentary or in lexicon, and the educational value of Babrius from this point of view has not been fully realized. On p. lix of the introduction he gives a short list, 'which,' he says, 'every reader of Babrius will be able to increase for himself.' His reason for this limitation was not only to satisfy his own sense of proportion and to avoid 'insulting the understanding of [his] readers,' but because questions of percentage are involved; and while 'it would be possible to represent numerically the differences in the frequency of such violations of usage between a typical Attic writer and such an author as Babrius,' it could only be done 'at a cost of labor quite incommensurate with the advantage.' Unfortunately one must run the risk of insulting the intelligence of some readers if one wishes to be useful to a large class, and the wearisome task of ascertaining proportions must be undergone, if such work is to be considered final. Of course it requires judgment to know when statistics will pay, and as Mr. Rutherford has decided that they will not pay, nothing more is to be said. If I were editing a post-classic Greek author I should not trouble myself to count all his articular infinitives, but in a commentary on Philostratos, for instance, I should not fail to notice the familiarity with which he employs the most daring constructions of this class, constructions which go back to Thukydides and Demosthenes, and I might be at the pains to count the rare combinations. Mr. Rutherford's disdainful attitude makes it hard to criticise the omissions of his commentary, and I may insult the intelligence of my readers by missing a note on 50, 6: *ὁ δ' οὐ προδῶσεν ὤμνῳ* which

and yet are rather full of errors and shows very strikingly the confusion of the author's mind. As Mr. Rutherford would call it, "carelessness" is the word if it be necessary, but as the meaning is so transparent that few would suspect a person for whom it might have been worth while to refer to the *Lexicon*, *New Phrynologia*, etc., where the word is considered. But after all it is only saying that Mr. Rutherford has a different deal.

Many of Mr. Rutherford's general grammatical views are sound and, though not altogether novel, need the emphasis which he has given them by his peculiar presentation. But on several points I could be obliged to differ with him, because he seems to imagine that later Greek syntax is a thing apart, an imported treatise, and not a breaking down of the barriers.

Among the statements made by Mr. Rutherford with portentous emphasis that are not consistent with a calm survey of the facts is one which I have elsewhere disposed of. Mr. Rutherford says, p. lvi, "except in the sense of *εἰπεῖν* the verb *εἶπεν* refuses in Attic any construction but that with *ὅτι* or *ὅς*." I have no objection to this as a rule for Greek prose composition, a rule, by the way which Mr. Sidgwick flagrantly violates: I recognize the fact that exceptions are comparatively rare, and, indeed, I have tried to explain the phenomenon in my commentary on Justin Martyr, Apol. I, 12, 32, which I will take the liberty of quoting: "*εἰπεῖν* in the sense of 'say' not 'order' commonly takes *ὅτι* or *ὅς* in classic Greek; but the exceptions are far more numerous than one should suppose from the way in which the rule is stated, as Thuc. 7, 35, 2; Hdt. 1, 39; 2, 30; Andoc. 1, 57; Xen. Hell. 1, 6, 7; 2, 2, 15; Cyr. 5, 5, 24; Plat. Gorg. 473 A; Legg. 2, 654 A [to which may be added 673 B]; Clitoph. 407 A; 460 A; Aeschin. 3, 37; Lycurg. contra Leocr. 50, to say nothing of the poets such as Pind. Ol. 7, 62; Soph. Antig. 755, etc. For later Greek, examples are not necessary. The rule, however, is not without its reason. *Εἰπεῖν* originally gives the exact utterance (*ἔπος*). So in Homer (*τάδ' εἶπεν*). When the *ὅτι* form of *oratio obliqua* became common, it was natural that this form, which is nearest to *oratio recta*, should be retained." Some of these examples have found their way into the new edition of Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, and others might be added, such as Lys. 10, 6; 9, 12 (*dis*), and Isaios 2, 29. But I know what Mr. Rutherford will say. He will say as he has said time after time, that Xenophon does not count, that Thucydides has to use an 'immature Attic' (p. 8 a), that Lysias 10 is questioned by Harpokration, though Blass does not know why. Nay, if Lysias 10 be proved genuine, Mr. Rutherford will be able to point triumphantly to a remark, p. 36 A, in which place he says "Mr. Gow, Fellow of Trinity College, has drawn my attention to the fact that French critics saw in Victor Hugo's works, written during his sojourn in Jersey, an absence of 'la malice et la délicatesse Parisienne,' and a similar *nescio quid* I have always felt the want of in Lysias' Attic." Taste so refined must be a positive curse, and the attainment of it can hardly be considered desirable. Most persons will think that what was good enough for Sophocles, what was good enough for Plato, was good enough for Babrius, and will not count it a special feather in the cap of the late fabulist that he slipped only once in this regard (Fab. 97, 4). But I do not wish to go into details which would involve long discussions of the fundamentals of Greek syntax. There are other points in which the edition deserves attention and commands respect. So

we have an elaborate and interesting introduction in which the person of Babrius, the history of Greek fable, the language of Babrius and the history of the text are discussed. Mr. Rutherford's style is perverse and does not deserve the commendation of conciseness which a friendly critic has bestowed upon it, but at all events it is not dull, and the collation of the Athoan MS preserved in the British Museum gives a special scientific value to this edition. Between the Athoan MS and the Vaticanus Mr. Rutherford thinks there is not much to choose, nor does he consider Suidas much better authority than the two sources mentioned. For his recension of the text he claims the character of conservatism, but when he does introduce his 'own tentamina' he does so with the same confidence that marks every line of his work. They are not numerous and few of them commend themselves irresistibly.

The edition has four indexes: 1. Index Fabularum; 2. An English Index; 3. A Greek Index; 4. Index Scriptorum and a welcome 'Graecitatis Babrianae Lexicon,' due in great part to Mr. H. Duff, Fellow of All Souls College, and 'intended as an aid to the work which sooner or later must be undertaken, and to which so little has been done—the scientific Lexicography of the Greek language.'

Mr. Rutherford's 'New Phrynichus,' it seems, has already become a standard work of reference in England and his Babrius will extend the reputation gained by his previous labors. A little closer study of Chandler's 'Greek Accentuation' would have been of service to him, but on this point also an improvement is to be noted, though he writes *γαυρή* in the text itself (95, 21) and emends a passage (107, 7) with *ἀμειβον*.

B. L. G.

---

Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit *πρίν*. Von Dr. JOSEF STURM. Würzburg: A. Stuber. 1882.

Dr. Sturm has done excellent service in his presentation of the historical development of the constructions of *πρίν*, and while I could have wished that he had made some use of the article on *πρίν* which appeared in this Journal, Vol. II, p. 465 foll.,<sup>1</sup> the coincidences are all the more gratifying to one who cares more for truth than for originality.

According to Dr. Sturm there are two principal periods separated from each other by sharp lines of demarcation. In the first period the use of *πρίν* is developing, in the second the development is completed.

The first period, which means Homer and Hesiod, shows us *πρίν* in its beginnings. The original construction *πρίν* with the infinitive was already developed, but as subjunctive and optative were just reaching vitality in Homer, no fixed

<sup>1</sup> I refer only to the theoretical discussion, for I have since discovered that the statistics of my collectors—inexperienced young men—were far from complete. This defect I had hoped to make good ere now by the dissertation of Lüth, *De usu particulae πρίν qualis apud oratores Atticos fuerit*, Rostock, 1877, but I have not been able to procure a copy. It is some consolation to know that Sturm had done the work over again before Lüth's dissertation had reached him; but he has only given a summary and not the references to the passages, so that I cannot make good the deficiencies in Demosthenes, which excited my surprise, if not my suspicion. See my article (l. c. p. 483).

norm of infinitive use as contradistinguished from subjunctive and optative uses could be attained. Hence the infinitive could be used indifferently after negative and after affirmative clauses.  $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  is used with the inf. as well as  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , but  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  is dying out, is never used with the subjunctive, and does not appear in Hesiod. The very rare subjunctive constructions betray the old parataxis. In Homer  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  never takes  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  or  $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu$ ; it is still purely adverbial.<sup>1</sup> Hence it is not yet suited to introduce a dependent clause in the indicative. The required sense is reached by  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  or by  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  γ'  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$   $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ , the latter formula not appearing in the subsequent period.

The second period embraces all the other authors of the classical time to Plato inclusive. The conditional relation was felt more and more as the subjunctive was developed more and more. Consequently the infinitive was restricted mainly to the affirmative relation, and on the other hand the connexion with the conditional sentence became very close. Parataxis vanishes;  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  like other conjunctions takes the particle  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , becomes a full conjunction and admits the indicative. The present infinitive is used more freely than in the first period, in which the aorist infinitive was almost exclusively employed. The perfect also comes in. The dawn of the new period is seen in Hesiod. In comparison with Homer the subjunctive is more frequently employed, and on the other hand the shadow of the old period falls here and there on Euripides and Herodotos.

In the second period Dr. Sturm distinguishes three groups. The first is represented by the writers of the New Ionic dialect.  $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}$  and  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon}$  are used not only with the infinitive but also with the indicative and subjunctive aorist. The optative is not found; the indicative is used only after negative sentences, and then the conjunction  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  is always strengthened by the particles  $\gamma\epsilon$   $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$  or  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ . The present infinitive is rare.

The second group embraces the poets and Thukydides.  $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}$  has vanished, not to reappear in our field of observation, nor do we find it in Attic inscriptions. The indicative is used after affirmative as well as after negative sentences. In Thukydides the particle  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$  is used only after affirmative sentences, except once.<sup>2</sup> The aor. opt. reappears. Theognis is the first to use it in assimilation. The subjunctive present occurs once in Thukydides, once in the fragments of the comic poets. The present and the perfect infinitive become relatively more common, the latter especially in Euripides and Aristophanes.

The third group is made up of Xenophon, the orators and Plato, and shows the following peculiarities: (1)  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  with the indicative is used only after nega-

<sup>1</sup> The paratactic origin of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  with subj. cannot be denied. See the passages cited in L. and Scott's *Lexicon* 7th ed. But it is hard to see how the construction can be purely adverbial throughout. Wherever  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  is preceded by  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , it is on its way to the conjunctive, and the difference here as elsewhere between Homer and later Greek is the difference between tendency and universality.  $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$  with the inf., the original construction, is itself often conditional, final.

<sup>2</sup> There is no discernible reason for this, and besides the statement rests on a sad blunder, the same blunder that Kühner made, as I pointed out L. c. p. 469. 1, 51, 1; 1, 118, 2; 3, 19, 1; 3, 104, 7 are negative and not affirmative. 7, 33, 2 and 7, 71, 5 show persistency which brings out the 'until' idea. See the passage from Anacharsis cited below. While correcting the faults of others, I must not omit to correct my own inadvertencies. In the article cited p. 469, 13 l. from bottom, for '7, 71, 5 . . .  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha$ ' read '3, 104, 7 . . .  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\alpha$ .' The false citation makes me contradict myself (p. 479, L. 3 from bottom).

tive clauses (except Aischin. 1, 64), and never takes a particle (except *πρίν γε* X. Oik. 7, 7). (b) the indicative is most frequently used by Xenophon. In the Isokrates it is chiefly employed in *οὐ πρότερον ἐπαύσατο πρίν* and similar phrases. In Plato it is dying out before *ἕως*. (c) In unreal sentences the indicative is found only in the orators and Plato. Euripides satisfies himself in two passages with the original infinitive. The present infinitive occurs with special frequency and reaches its height in Xenophon, and the present subjunctive and opt. are comparatively more common. (d) Instead of *πρίν* we find for the first time *πρὸ τοῦ* with the infinitive. *Πρότερον ἢ* seldom does duty for *πρίν*, and is limited to the infinitive. (e) *ἢ πρίν*, a new combination, emerges in Xenophon.

So much for the facts. As for the theory, Dr. Sturm argues against the explanation of *πρίν* with the inf. as arising from parataxis, and well he may, for it is sheer nonsense. The infinitive must be dependent, but how dependent? To the prepositional theory he is utterly opposed on the ground of the historical *salutis*. Such a construction would require the article, an old objection. Besides neither *πρίν* nor *πάρος* is used as a preposition in Homer. Sanskrit analogies, such as *prad* with the inf., suggested by Wilhelm and taken up by Monro, are made doubtful by Jolly's refusal to consider these Sanskrit genitives and ablatives as true infinitives. The omission of *ἢ* is extremely hazardous in view of the fact that Homer uses *πρίν ἢ* only twice and *πρίν* with the inf. 79 times. Schömann's parallelism between *πρίν* with inf. and *ἢ ὥστε* with the infinitive is condemned as unhistorical. *Πρίν* is fullblown — *ὥστε* at best emergent. Passing by other theories of which enough has been said in the article already referred to, we come to the one on which Dr. Sturm builds. The infinitive is the limit of *πρίν*. *Πρίν γενέσθαι* is 'sooner with reference to.' This is the explanation given by Wagner, the explanation adopted by Holzweissig, as one of the certain results of comparative grammar, and there is no denying that it does not require so wide a leap as the prepositional theory. And yet the parallels are not altogether satisfactory. In O 642: *ἀμείνων παντοίας ἀρετάς, ἡμὲν πόδας ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι*, in A 258: *οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλήν Δαναῶν, περὶ δ' ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι* the preliminary accusative saves the construction; ζ 230: *μεῖζονά τ' εἰσίδειν καὶ πάσσονα* is nearer, and so is ν 33: *ἀσπασίως δ' ἄρα τῷ κατέδν φάος ἡελίοιο δόρπον ἐποίχεσθαι*, but the position of *πρίν* so far away from the verb, to which, on this theory, it really belongs, is unexplained. I cannot help thinking that Schömann, however wrong historically, was not so hopelessly wrong grammatically in his parallelism between *πρίν* and *ὥστε*. 'Ὡστε as Sturm himself has pointed out is in the same line of development, though later. We must always start with the final use of the infinitive, and if *πρίν* with the infinitive is to begin as 'prevention' and end as 'priority' we shall be nearer the truth than if we begin with some such abstraction as 'in Bezug auf.' But whatever the origin, the question of the prepositional feeling remains untouched. Nobody considers *ὥς* with the acc. a preposition, and yet it is in feeling a preposition. Nobody considers 'than' a preposition, and yet it behaves as such. We must learn to respect the conceptions of the users of language.

The combination *πρίν γ' ὅτε δῆ* would seem to postulate a quasi-prepositional use of *πρίν*, and one might be tempted to compare the history of *ἕως, μέχρι (ἄχρι)*

and perhaps even *εσσε*. Dr. Sturm sticks to the original parataxis, *πρίν γε* belongs to the first part, *ὅτε δὲ* begins a new sentence. So M 436: *ὡς μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰσα μάχῃ τέτατο πόλεμός τε | πρίν γ' ὅτε δὲ Ζεὺς κῆδος ὑπέκρετον* 'Εκτορι δῶκεν, must be interpreted 'The battle hung in the balance—at least before: when now Zeus gave Hector the victory = until Zeus gave H. the victory.' To this it may be objected that if *πρίν* had already become almost a formula with the infinitive, there is no reason why the analogy should not have been extended to the finite constructions.

As to the prevalence of the aorist infinitive in Homer, Sturm simply accepts what Cavallin had said about the tenses of the infinitive. We do not need to be told by Cavallin that the tenses of the infinitive have to do primarily only with the kind of time. That has been a common possession for several decades, and my objection to this statement is that the student is put off with a formula which he does not always know how to apply, and I think it well to give emphasis to the negative element of *πρίν* in order to bring the use of the aorist inf. more clearly to the consciousness. The prevalence of the finite aorist after the negated *πρίν* is simply in accordance with the general needs of the temporal sentence. Overlapping<sup>1</sup> action is less common than clear priority and posteriority. Hence *πρίν ἄν* with the pres. subj. is rare, and Dr. Sturm has actually denied its existence in the tragic poets in spite of Sophokles, Phil. 1409.

Dr. Sturm defends the passage in Solon (36, 21): *οὐτ' ἄν κατέσχε δῆμον οὐτ' ἐπαύσατο, | πρίν ἄν παράξας πῖαρ ἐξέλεν γάλα* on the ground that the author had in his mind a familiar proverb with the future or the optative with *ἄν* in the lead (*ὅς παύσεται* or *οὐκ ἄν παύσαιο*). This is a kind of *repraesentatio* and is the only possible explanation, but not satisfactory in an unreal sentence as I have said (A. J. P., I 458) where I suggested *πρίν ἀναπαράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα*, or better *ἐξελεῖν γάλα*, referring to the very passage in Eur. Alc. 373 which Dr. Sturm has cited. I am glad to see that he has accepted Förster's *ἔλασθαι* for *ἔλαται* in Simon. Amorg. 1, 12, a verse treated at length in my article cited (p. 468), though neither Förster nor Sturm has tried to account for the error.

I would add that the spread of *πρίν ἢ* in late Greek seems to be due partly to the mechanical grammar of the post-classic period, partly to the influence of Herodotos. The final step, which we find perpetuated in modern Greek, the use of *πρίν ἢ* with subj. in all classes of sentences, affirmative and negative, is not noticed by Dr. Sturm, although it might fairly be considered to lie in the line of development.

I have previously intimated, the practical results of Dr. Sturm's treatise have mainly been anticipated, but it is one thing to have laid down the lines of usage, another to show the history of the construction with living proofs, and I should be the last one to withhold from Dr. Sturm the praise for his laborious and in the main careful piece of work.

B. L. G.

one of the rare imperfections. Dem. 9, 61: *ὅν πρότερον ἀνέλαμψεν εἰδείς ῥῆξαι φωνήν καὶ ταύτῃ προσέειπεν*. The positive expression would be *εἰδὼς ἢ . . . προσέειπεν, τότε*



*Lysiae Orationes XVI.* Edited by E. S. SHUCKBURGH, M. A. Macmillan & Co., 1882.

The orations comprised in this edition are those which are numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32. The selection is probably as good a one as could have been made. It nearly coincides with that adopted by Frohberger in his school edition, which, however, Mr. Shuckburgh does not seem to have used or to have known. The text used is substantially that of Scheibe in the Teubner series; but occasional variations from it are made, which are for the most part noted at the foot of the pages. The editor thus describes his own views in preparing the book: "My object in the commentary has been to bring before the student, as far as possible, the circumstances, social and historical, in which the speeches were delivered; and at the same time to direct his attention to an accurate study of the language." Of these two purposes, it will probably be thought that the former has been most successfully accomplished. The editor has adopted an excellent method for enabling students to follow with interest the arguments of the speeches. An account of the circumstances under which each was delivered, so far as these can be ascertained, is placed before the notes in each case; but in addition to this, throughout the speeches themselves at frequent intervals, the editor has inserted spirited summaries of the argument of the adjacent sections. Such historical or antiquarian information as is necessary for the understanding of allusions is supplied in the notes with succinctness and accuracy for the most part; and there are five useful appendices, the most elaborate being on the usurpation of "The Thirty." On the whole and notwithstanding all the shortcomings which have been noted, a few of which will now be referred to, this book may be cordially recommended to instructors as very much more useful than any edition with English commentary which has heretofore been accessible to American students.

In the text itself, set up as it was from Scheibe's printed pages, the editor seems to have trusted too much to the diligence of the proof-reader; for such words as *πεδίῳ*, *σώματος*, *ἀπετόλμησε*, *τυγχάνει*, occur not with extreme rarity. But the same scapegoat can hardly bear the blame of 'C. Scheiber in the Teubner series' of the preface, or of the *tt* which, on p. 8, Baiter has assumed, perhaps in emulation of the *pp* which Sauppe enjoys. Indeed, there are too many marks of hasty work in both text and notes. The citation made in the very first note is rendered unintelligible by the omission of a word. On p. 194, in a note on the *μέτοικοι*, the writer tells us that they were "subject to military service, though they were not admitted to serve as hoplites"; and in confirmation of this we are referred to Xen. Vect. 2, 2. If that passage is examined, it will be seen that Xenophon expressly asserts, and at the same time deprecates, the liability of the *μέτοικοι* to serve as hoplites; and Boeckh also, who is referred to in the same note, says that they served as hoplites, at first only among the garrison-soldiers, but at a later time in campaigns. The statement, also, that they "were liable for any offence against the various enactments concerning them to be sold as slaves," is not supported by the passage of Boeckh referred to, where we are told they incurred such liability only if they failed to pay the *μετοίκιον*, and is denied by Hermann (p. 226 of the London edition,



1836, which is the one Mr. Shuckburgh has made use of), who says that they "were sold as slaves only when they assumed the peculiar privileges of actual citizens, omitted to pay the tax, and, probably, if they neglected to choose a patron." The note on the *δασυραί*, on p. 222, is equally inaccurate. The question as to their number cannot be regarded as entirely settled as yet, but probably no one will be found to support Mr. Shuckburgh's statement that there were only forty, four being chosen annually by lot from each tribe. See on this matter Perrot *Droit Public d'Athènes*, p. 289 ff. The assertion, too, that "before the time of Demosthenes all civil suits were heard first before one of them," is much too broadly stated. Hermann, §145, goes fully as far as the authorities warrant, in saying that the system of employing arbitrators "freilich später um der damit verknüpften geringeren Kosten und Gefahren willen eine solche Ausdehnung erhalten hatte, dass dieselben förmlich als eine erste Instanz in den meisten Privatprocessen betrachtet werden dürfen." On p. 303 we have a strange interpretation of *ἐδόκουν κάκιον γεγονέναι* 'they seemed to be of a somewhat inferior character.' The true explanation is quoted from Bremi (cf. Cobet, V. L. p. 158), that the phrase means 'worse-born, not true-bred Athenian,' but is deliberately rejected, and we are told that we must suppose "a phrase *κακῶς γίγνεσθαι* equivalent to *κακῶς ἔχειν*, 'to be ill,' i. e. in behavior, reputation, etc." In Or. XII 31, where the orator says that Eratosthenes, though sent, as he asserted, by the Thirty to arrest Polemarchus, might easily have declared that he did not meet him or had not seen him, *ταῦτα γὰρ οὐτ' ἐλεγχον οὔτε βάσανον εἶχεν, ὥστε μὴδ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν βουλομένων οἶόν τ' εἶναι ἐξελεγχθῆναι*, we are told, p. 237, to translate the last words 'did not involve or admit of refutation or examination by torture.' On p. 246 we read: "for the name of Aristocrates as a leader of the moderates we are indebted to Lysias, not Thucydides"; but in Thuc. VIII 89, 2, we find *Ἀριστοκράτην τὸν Σκελλίου* mentioned along with Theramenes, and yet Thuc. VIII 90 is referred to in this very note.

told to translate *τὸν πατρός πρὸς μητρός πάππον*, 'his grandfather on his mother's side.' This error is due to the mistaken reference just before to the elder instead of to the younger Alcibiades. Some confusion in the passage of Isocrates referred to, or the mistake as the father of Cleinias must have been named Alcibiades. Kennell's Pindar, Pyth. VII, 1.

is left to speak of the grammatical notes. Reference is made to Prof. Goodwin's books, and occasionally to the Greek syntax of Clyde. A considerable number of points have been marked for correction, chiefly faults of omission. As a single instance we may take the note on *πολλῶ ῥά διον ἡγοῦμαι εἶναι ὑπὲρ ὧν ὑμεῖς ἐπάσχετε ἀντιπεῖν, ἢ κήμασιν ἀπολογησασθαι*, where *ῥά διον*—*ἢ* is passed without remark when a note is given it is sometimes not as clear as could be. In Or. XII 82, *τί γὰρ ἂν παθόντες δίκην τὴν ἀξίαν εἴησαν τῶν ἐργῶν* (p. 249), "'will they have fully paid the penalty they deserve'" periphrasis for a perfect optative see Madv. §180 d. It refers to things that would *then* be past."

true, gives *Alcibiades* as the name of the grandfather of Cleinias, leaving But that in this family there is no improbability that the name of both was by the fact that the Alcibiades of the speech was the son of the famous one.

Mr. Shuckburgh's opinion of Theramenes (p. 245) may be quoted to conclude this notice. "I think it is clear, from a careful review of our authorities, that Theramenes was an honest man. But he was a philosopher and a doctrinaire, and had a Socratic ideal of a perfect state which, both in the time of the Four Hundred and in that of the Thirty, he thought he saw his way to realise, but was quickly undeceived by the development of selfish aims in his colleagues. As, therefore, he sympathised neither with the prejudices of the Democrats, nor with the self-seeking of the Oligarchs, he came to be trusted by neither."

C. D. MORRIS.

---

Gorboduc, or Ferrex and Porrex; a tragedy, by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, A. D. 1561. Edited by L. TOULMIN SMITH. Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger. [Englische Sprach- und Literaturdenkmale des 16, 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts; herausgegeben von KARL VOLLMÖLLER, I.]

This series, which an enterprising German publishing house has undertaken, and of which Gorboduc is the first number, will meet a real want of scholars, in England and America as well as in Germany. The series could also not have been better begun than with this piece, the first English Tragedy. To many it was not accessible in Dodsley's "Old Plays," and was unfortunately omitted in the last (1874) edition of that collection. The other editions are somewhat rare. Arber announced it in 1869 and subsequently, as among his forthcoming Reprints, but it did not appear. The edition now issued is not only handy and inexpensive, with clear type and on good paper, but has also an additional value for scholars in the full collations of the editions of 1565 and 1590, appended at the foot of each page. The text itself is that of the (authorized) edition of 1570. The editor, Lucy Toulmin Smith, a contributor to the *Anglia*, and joint editor for the Early English Text Society of *English Gilds*, has also prefixed an English Introduction, and added explanatory notes, also in English. The work of editing seems to have been well and carefully done; the collations and Introduction are especially good. The notes are in part less valuable. On the one hand explanations are given such as no English scholar, and in many cases no intelligent reader of English literature needs, and on the other, interesting questions of grammar, phonology, etc., are only slightly touched upon or omitted altogether. Where is the need, for instance, in an edition intended to supply to scholars the materials for a critical text of the oldest English tragedy, of explanations like these: *reck*, to heed, to care for (390), *marches*, borders (414), *avowed*, a-vowed, promised on oath (574), *guerdon*, reward, recompense (1437), *in fine*, in the end, at last (1539), *want*, lack (1715)? There are surely enough interesting forms of speech inviting discussion, and questions of all sorts connected with this play, to make us regret such a waste of valuable space.

L. 465 *to reue me halfe the kingdome*, the editor is hardly correct in saying: "*reue me*, the preposition is suppressed, compare l. 513 *to reauue from me my native right*." It is the new use with the preposition that is 'suppressing' the time-honored dative of interest, cf. 809 *To reauue me and my sonnes the hatefull breath*. 1691, *courage* is said to have been 'brought in by Chaucer.' No doubt he helped bring it into vogue, but he did not introduce it. The word occurs in Early

English Alliterative Poems, ed. Morris, and in the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, both of which were written before Chaucer was at work on the *Canterbury Tales*; and Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle* (end of the 13th century) has *corageus*.

On p. xxv the editor has some good remarks on the instructive differences between the earlier and later edition in the grammatical forms. It is to be regretted that such differences are not oftener pointed out and explained in the notes. For instance, where the two earlier editions have forms like *wast* (919), or *hast* (935), the edition of 1590 usually adds *e*, *waste*, *haste*, etc.; 1032 only the first edition has *wast*, the others *waste*. For the significance of such final silent *e*, as regards the lengthening of the stem vowel *a*, 'a feeling which perhaps came in towards the close of the 15th century,' see Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, p. 567.

P. xxv, the *d* which represents Anglo-Saxon *ð* in many words is spoken of as 'the old *d*,' and 383 (should be 382) *furder* is referred to as an instance where the ed. of 1590 has *further*. Under line 210 we find the note: "*Furder*, the A. S. *ð* was often retained by the early printers as *d*. It frequently so occurs in the ed. of 1565." This seems to misapprehend the facts of the case completely. Northumbrian Anglo-Saxon, *Orm*, *Hali Meidenhad*, *Lazamon*, and many other early monuments exhibit frequently *d* for *ð* (*p*). It is extremely common in Middle Scotch also, and Murray (*Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, p. 121) says: "the *d* (before *r*, as in *furder*) was pronounced, I believe, neither as in *dare* nor in *there*, but with an intermediate sound, the front or dental *d* (formed by touching the teeth with the tip of the tongue), still used in the same words in the Northern English Counties."

The references in our edition to Anglo-Saxon forms contain a few errors: *behatan* (166) should be *behátan*; 762 an A. S. form *scyl*, reason, is cited. Both word and meaning are incorrect. Bosworth does indeed give *scyle*, difference, variety, distinction, on the doubtful authority of Somner, but there is no accredited A. S. form of the word. It is derived from the Old Norse *skil*, distinction, discernment. The meaning attached to *unskilfull* (361), 'wanting in knowledge,' should be 'wanting in discernment,' and the note to 201 should read not 'reasonable' but 'discerning.' The instances in *Ancren Riwe* and elsewhere, in which *skill* has the derived meaning 'reason,' only confirm this.

1002, the form *abycyan*, nearly as common in A. S. as the *abicyan* given in the note, would have been a better illustration of *bye*, to pay for, since the *y* represents original *u*.

1160, an A. S. verb *racan*, to scrape (rake), is referred to. It should be *raccian*. The form *raken* (without *i*) is found in very early English, however, though connected with Old Norse *raka*. Compare Mätzner, *Altengl. Sprachproben*, I 82, l. 2132.

In addition to the editor's remarks on alliteration, pp. xv-xvi, it is worth while to note that in two cases, at least, the edition of 1570 preserves the alliteration complete where both the other editions miss it. This can hardly be an accident, and tends to show that this authorized edition was prepared for the press with some care. The edition of 1590 is based upon that of 1565; which accounts for the recurrence in it of the non-alliterative forms of the lines in question (350, 538). Bodensedt remarks of Shakspeare's *Macbeth* that the words *blood* and *bloody* 'reappear on almost every page, and run like a red thread

through the whole piece.' A far more surprising frequency of the words is noticeable in *Gorboduc*. In the 4th and 5th acts (Sackville's part) they occur 33 times. The words *egal*, *egalnesse* = equal, etc., common enough in Middle English, but rare in Shakspeare (cf. *Tit. Andron.* IV 4, 4), occur very often, *e. g.* 111, 220, 250, 255, 270, 336, 412, 516, 855, 1139, 1159. Even Chaucer, who uses both forms, *egal* and *equals*, is not nearly so partial to the former as the authors of this tragedy, nearly 200 years later.

In conclusion we heartily recommend this, in the main, excellent edition of *Gorboduc* to all scholars and lovers of English literature.

H. W.

---

Sammlung Französischer Neudrucke. Herausgegeben von KARL VOLLMÖLLER.  
Nos. 3, 4, 5. Heilbronn: Henninger.

This collection is one of the most important that have yet begun to appear in any department of French philology. The difficulty of getting texts at a moderate cost to work from has been the chief drawback to the progress of middle-French study. As the transition period from the old to the modern language it is now beginning to claim the attention of scholars that it deserves, and in a few years, with these new facilities for investigation, we may expect rich results drawn from them for the department of grammar, and especially for the historic development of French syntax and versification.

Numbers 1 and 2 of the collection appeared in 1881, the former containing *Le Festin de Pierre ou Le Fils Criminel*, by de Villiers, and edited anew by W. Knörich; the latter, *Traité de la Comedie et des Spectacles*, by the celebrated Armand de Bourbon, Prince de Conti, and newly edited by Prof. Vollmöller himself. We now have before us the three following numbers of this interesting series, which, together with the sixth, are edited by Prof. Wendelin Förster, of Bonn, and consist of *Les Tragedies*, de Robert Garnier (1534-90). All three of these volumes are faithful reprints of the third general and first complete edition of Garnier's works, published at Paris only five years before his death. They are furnished with the variations of all preceding general editions, and are to be followed in the fourth volume (No. 6 of the series) with a short glossary for the whole set, containing all words not found in Sachs's French Dictionary.

It was the year in which Ronsard, the most celebrated French poet of the sixteenth century, died (1585) that the first complete edition of Garnier's works was brought out at Paris by the then celebrated publisher Patisson. It is this edition, as annotated and revised by the author himself, which Prof. Förster has made the basis of his text, adding thereto not only the various readings of the general collections, as just mentioned, but also those of the single issues of each tragedy—*Porcie* 1568, *Hippolyte* 1573, *Cornelie* 1574, *Marc Antoine* 1578, *La Troade* 1579, *Antigone* 1580, *Bradamante* 1582—with the exception of *Les Ivifves*, which, so far as is now known, was never published separately.

In the edition of 1585 these tragedies are not arranged chronologically, but have the following order: *Porcie*, *Cornelie*, *Marc Antoine*, *Hippolyte*, *La Troade*, *Antigone*, *Les Ivifves*, *Bradamante*, and Vollmöller in re-editing the text has divided up his material so as to give it to us in as nearly equal parts as possible. He

therefore puts Porcie, Cornelia, and Marc Antoine in Vol. I; Vol. II comprises Hippolyte and La Troade; Vol. III, Antigone and Les Ivifves; while Vol. IV will contain Garnier's *chef-d'œuvre*, Bradamante, with a short biographical sketch of the author and the vocabulary noticed above. To the first of these pieces (Porcie) all the orthographic variations will also be given, that the student of mid-French may be better able to appreciate the fact that there did not exist in the XVI century a regular, uniform mode of writing.

Garnier wrote eight tragedies in all, and of the seven to which the general reader here has access he will find Les Ivifves the most original, the most interesting and altogether the best. It is here that the author cuts loose from his servile imitation of Greek authors, which so strongly characterizes his preceding works, and stimulated by a noble sentiment, draws more upon his own individuality for the treatment of his subject, which, as he himself thinks in his dedication, ought to appeal in a peculiar manner to the best impulses of the human heart. He was an intimate friend of Ronsard, who was most lavish in the praise of his works, as may be seen in his letter prefixed to La Troade:

" Si Bacchus retournoit au manoir Plutonique,  
Il ne voudroit Eschyle au monde redonner,  
Il te choisiroit seul, qui seul peux estonner  
Le theatre François de ton Cothurne antique."

Marot, Du Bellay, Rabelais and Montaigne, all contemporaries of the author of Les Tragedies, highly appreciated his literary productions, and that they were extensively read is shown by the fact that in the first two decades of the XVII century they passed through about thirty editions. His tragedies mark an epoch of remarkable advance for the French stage, which has been justly characterized by Adolf Eberts in his excellent *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Französischen Tragödie*, where he has devoted to this poet a brilliant study with reference to his paramount importance for the development of the French drama.

A. M. E.

---

GULIELMO STUDEMUND. *Due Commedie Parallele di Difilo*. Torino: Ermanno Loescher. (21 pp. with an apographum Codicis Ambrosiani G. 82 sup. rescripti paginae 244.) 1883.

On the 28th of September, 1882, at the thirty-sixth meeting of German philologists and school-teachers in Karlsruhe, Prof. Wilhelm Studemund delivered a most interesting address on two parallel comedies of Diphilus. An Italian translation of this address by Dr. Aristide Baragiola, prepared for the *Rivista di Filologia ed Istruzione Classica*, forms the subject of this notice.

After showing that the fertility of production of the famous Greek poets of the new comedy, Menander, Philemon, and Diphilus, was due largely to the employment of similar plots or motives, spiced with a variety of incidents and characters, Prof. Studemund calls attention to the frequent role which shipwreck plays in these plots, and the final disentanglement of the knot by means of an *ἀναγνώρισις*, often brought about by means of toys (*crepundia*) or trinkets belonging to the person in whom the chief interest centres. Of this sort is the play entitled *Rudens*, which was composed by Plautus, probably in the last decade

of his life, in imitation of a Greek original of Diphilus, the Greek title of which is not however given in the Prologue. Prof. Studemund presents a brief outline of the play, and shows that it must have followed the Greek original much more closely than the burlesque *Casina*, which is based upon the *Κληρούμενοι*, also a comedy of Diphilus. Now the *Vidularia* (Wallet-comedy), of which considerable fragments are found in the Ambrosianus and scattered through the Roman grammarians, shows a striking resemblance in its situations to the *Rudens*, so that the latter might just as well have the title *Vidularia*, and the very fact that it is not so called would seem to indicate a later date of composition. The *Rudens* it will be remembered gets its name from the rope wound about the *vidulus* which the fisherman Gripus has hauled up from the sea in his net. The scene of the *Vidularia* like that of the *Rudens* is laid on the sea coast. There is a fisherman, Gorgo, a shipwrecked youth of good family named Nicodemus, an evil-minded slave, Cacistus, who fights with Gorgo for the possession of a *vidulus* dragged up by the latter's net. The *vidulus* contains a ring which eventually brings about the recognition of Nicodemus by his father Dinia, who fortunately lives close by. Other details, for which there is no space here, by their surprising correspondence with the *Rudens*, make it probable that the original of the *Vidularia* was also the work of Diphilus. But Prof. Studemund has raised this probability to a certainty. With a patience and indefatigableness of which few men would be capable, he has succeeded after repeated efforts, which in all consumed quite a month, in so far deciphering a page of the Ambrosian palimpsest as to make it clear that it contained a Prologus to the *Vidularia*. The seventh and eighth lines, although by no means every letter can be read, have been reconstructed by him with great acumen and great probability as follows:

Sc(h)edi[a haec] vo[catast a] g[r]ae[co com]o[edia]  
[P]oeta ha[nc] noster f[ecit] V[idularia]m.

Now comes the interesting part. *Σχέδια* as a comedy-title is attested but for one Greek poet, and that poet is Diphilus. The *Etymologicum Magnum* has preserved one verse of the play (cf. A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comico-rum Graecorum*, I, p. 456; IV, p. 410; V, p. cccviii). The appended apographon of the page in question of the Ambrosianus is a marvel of painstaking accuracy. The discovery itself is one which will interest all Plautine scholars. The labor which it has cost will probably be appreciated by few. If Prof. Studemund could live always, with his keen vision unimpaired, we might hope for many palimpsests to yield us such surprises. Meantime we should be only too grateful if the punctilious 'Thensaurochrysonicocrypsides' would vouchsafe us at once his apographon of the Ambrosian palimpsest, and give us the fruits of his future vacations in Milan in the form of addenda or corrigenda.

MINTON WARREN.

---

Altfranzösische Bibliothek. Herausgegeben von Dr. WENDELIN FÖRSTER.  
Dritter Band. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Three volumes of this important collection have already appeared, viz. Vol. I, Chardry's *Josaphaz*, Set Dormanz und Petit Plet, an Anglo-Norman poem of the XIII century, edited by J. Koch; Vol. II, *Karls des Grossen Reise nach*

Jerusalem und Constantinopel, an Old French poem of the XI century, edited by Prof. Edward Koschwitz of Greifswald, Vol. IV, Lothringischer Psalter, an Old French translation of the XIV century, edited by the late, much lamented Friedrich Anfelstedt. We have here before us the third volume of the series, Octavian, utfranzösischer Roman, nach der Oxford Handschrift, Bodl. Hatton 100. Herausgegeben von Prof. Karl Vollmöller of the University of Göttingen.

This Bodleian index is in small octavo form, contains 108 leaves, and both from the language and from historic references found in it must be assigned to the epoch in the thirteenth century when Jerusalem was in possession of the Christians, that is, between 1220 and 1244. In a portion of the MS published in England as far back as 1800—J. J. Conybeare: *The romance of Octavian, Emperor of Rome*, abridged from a MS of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1809—the editor attempted to show that the author was an Anglo-Norman and that the poem was written in England, but according to the investigation of the language carried out in the present edition there can no longer be any doubt about its being originally a Picard production, with certain variations of form that have naturally crept into it through copyists. The author is not known, but the poem as we have it here is the work of an Anglo-Norman copyist, who has mixed up Norman with Picard forms, in such a way, however, that the original dialect is easily recognizable. It is composed in regular eight-syllable verse, which has been frequently tampered with by the copyist, who has seen fit sometimes to increase, sometimes to cut short the legitimate number of syllables.

There is a *chanson de geste*, Florent et Octavien, belonging to the fourteenth century, and yet unpublished, and of which three MSS exist in the National Library at Paris. With this later treatment of the same subject Prof. Vollmöller compares the Oxford text and finds them to agree in all essential points up to near the close of the latter, which rapidly comes to an end, while the *chanson* goes on, according to the style of that time, and brings in all sorts of extraneous matter connected with secondary personages, repetitions, long drawn-out tales, etc., etc. From this striking agreement in the main line of the story the editor concludes that both documents are based upon an old *chanson de geste*, probably belonging to the twelfth century, and which is more faithfully reproduced in the Octavian, published here, than in the later *chanson* of the fourteenth century. Extensive extracts from the latter are to be found in the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXVI, p. 334 et seq. (1873), where our present text is simply mentioned as "quatrième manuscrit de Florent et Octavian."

Dr. Sarrazin of Marburg is now at work on an edition of the middle-English Octavian poem, in which he will discuss its relation to the French version. This will be likely to throw much light on the origin of the different sets of MSS of this favorite theme of the middle ages, and thus be of great interest to scholars of the Romance field, besides furnishing them with more material for the study of the close linguistic relations of the English and Normanized version before us.

A. M. E.



## REPORTS.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch. Wien, 1882.

Soon after the publication of P. Erasmus Müller's Sagabibliothek, it was admitted by most scholars that the Thidrekssaga was indebted to a mixing of several sagas for its origin, some of them but loosely joined to the central figure, Thidrek of Bern, and in this respect none more so than the story of the jarls Iron and Apollonius.

Friedrich Neumann now opens the first number with an article in which he proposes to show that this story consists of two separate sagas blended into one in the Thidrekssaga. Furthermore, to reproduce as nearly as possible according to context their original form, trace the connection of the Apolloniussaga with the Kudrunsaga and explain the origin of chapters 245-75 in the Thidrekssaga. The article brings to bear a good deal of the light of common sense upon the subject, and the conclusions arrived at by Neumann, we think, are sound. The separate sagas of Iron and Apollonius were rather unskillfully united by the writer of chapters 245-75. The two jarls were made brothers, and to connect them with the heroes of the Thidrekssaga the names of Attila, Diefrich, Ermanrich and others were arbitrarily introduced. As regards the points of similarity between the Apolloniussaga and the Kudrun, we must confess that they are often as striking as are found in other sagas quoted by editors of the Kudrun, "und selbst wenn wir bei dem Mühlenhoffschen Kudrun text schwören sollten," which we do not, having always looked upon this reading as an anthology of 'âventiuren' from the epic which, according to the taste of Mühlenhoff, were the most beautiful.

C. Marold continues his article "Kritische Untersuchungen über den Einfluss des Latein. auf die Gothische Bibel übersetzung (cf. American Journal of Philology, Vol. II, 7), and C. Mogk prints eleven fragments of one of the many versions belonging to Rudolf v. Ems' "Weltchronik." The original leaves (twelve) are in the Royal Library in Kopenhagen, and according to Edzardi were found attached to the covers of some law books in 1862 by assistant librarian Weeke. They seem to have been written about 1300, and represent a new phase of that favorite work of the middle ages.

Fedor Bech in a brief paper draws attention to a verb *dougen*, *tougen*, occurring with Middle German writers. The places where it is found are either not mentioned by Lexer in his M. H. G. Wörterbuch, or, following W. Grimm's and Pfeiffer's explanation of the word, placed with the wrong verb. Earliest and most frequently it is found in writings that originated in the west of Middle Germany.

Ich dougen des scharpfen swerdes slach (25, 7)

Owê wat wir dougen (29, 6).—*Marienlegenden*, ed. W. Grimm.



Grimm in a note says *dougen* = verborgen tragen, verheimlichen, and Lexer accordingly places it under *tougen* = verheimlichen, with which it has nothing to do, but evidently belongs to the Low German *dōgen* = leiden, erdulden (cf. Schiller-Lübbers, M. N. D. Wörterbuch, I 532). Pfeiffer in his glossary to Nicolaus v. Jeroschin (east of Middle Germany) identified *dougen* with *douwen* = verdauen, and Lexer notes *dougen* as a secondary form of *douwen*, Vol. I, 455 (cf. Weinhold Gramm. §206, Müller-Zarncke M. H. D. Wörterbuch, I 386a, Schade Altd. Wörterbuch, p. 97). On p. 1480, Vol. II, Lexer only has the noun *toufe* as a stf. In the "Wartburgkrieg," 116, 6 ed. Simrock, occurs *mit der toufen*, and in the "Parzival," 43, 6, *starb er äne toufen stt* (cf. Lexer Nachträge, 375, *toufen* stn.). Bech suggests a nominative *toufene*, *toufen*, as a secondary form of *toufe* (cf. Grimm Gram. 2, 171, Weinhold Gram. § 256).

Vernaleken furnishes a parallel to Grimm's fable "Das wasser des Lebens." This version of the ancient and popular myth which he gathered in the Schratenthal in Lower Austria differs in the main but little from Grimm's story.

Reinhold Bechstein reviews Alwin Schultz's work "Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesänger," I Vol., Leipzig, 1879. In the course of his eulogy on the book he says that he cannot help being in a measure vexed that an art historian should have taken the initiative in a matter which so entirely belongs to philology. But when he looks about among his fellow-philologists he can not find one—Weinhold excepted—who would be able to write a book like this one. This is a lamentable fact in the midst of a science that otherwise does such good work. "Thus it cannot remain," he exclaims, "Wir müssen den realien fortan einen grösseren einfluss einräumen. Die realien müssen unsere kritischen und hermeneutischen, selbst unsere grammatischen studien durchdringen und befruchten, sonst bleiben wir im leblosen krame stecken."

The Book Notices of the first number close with favorable criticisms by K. J. Schröder and Felix Liebrecht of Amelie Sohr's book "Heinrich Rückert in seinem Leben und Wirken," Weimar, 1880, and Eva Wigström's (Ave) Folkdigtning, samlad och upptecknad i Skåne, Köbenhavn, 1880.

The Miscellany contains a rather spirited reply from G. Milchsack to Anton Schönbach's adverse criticism (Anzeiger f. d. Alt. 7, 1881) of M.'s edition of the Heidelberg Passion play and two fragments (Passional and Konrad's Trojanerkrieg) by Bartsch.

R. Springer contributes the first article of the second number "Die legende vom Judenknaben." Of the popular legend of the Jewish boy who, with his Christian playmates, goes to communion and is punished for it by his father by being thrown into the flames, but saved from death by the Virgin, we possess not less than 5 Greek, 14 Latin and 8 French texts (cf. Bibliotheca normannica, ed. Suchier, Vol. II, Halle, 1879). Besides the versions in Spanish, Arabic, etc., we have two in German, "Das Jüdel," published by Hahn (poems of the 12th and 13th centuries) and Mühlhoff (Altdeutsche Sprachproben), and "Der Judenknabe," printed by F. Pfeiffer (Marienlegenden), which differ materially in the treatment of the legend from that in the other languages. Sprenger gives a critical text of the "Jüdel," places it with the classic period of M. H. G., the 12th century (cf. Wackernagel Lit., p. 205), and makes Konrad v. Heimesfurt the author. He considers it the older version upon which the younger "Der Judenknabe" was partly based.

From Sprenger's text :

hende winden unde klagen  
unt weinen was dâ wider strît  
unz nâhen ze complête zit  
331. daz man dâ *tavelle* in der stat.

we note the following correction for Müller-Zarncke M. H. D. Wörterbuch, Lexer Handwörterbuch, and Weigand Deutsches Wörterbuch. Müller, Vol. III, 19 *tavelen* swv. = tafel halten, speisen (quotes v. 331 above). Lexer, II, 1410 has additional explanations of the word, among them "durch Anschlagen an eine hölzerne Tafel ein Zeichen geben (statt des Läutens)," cf. *tävern*, Schmeller, I 587. This meaning should be taken in v. 331. On holy Friday no bell is rung in Catholic countries, but the sign to begin service is given by knocking on a wooden tablet. *Tafeln* = speisen is New-German, emend. Weigand II<sup>3</sup> 871.

F. Pfaff supplies a Middle German fragment (240 verses in the city archives, Frankfurt a. M.) of Reinbot's Georg, to which Bartsch adds a list of the known MSS of that poem, and K. G. Andresen sends an almost exhaustive list of family names derived from *diet*, *thiuda*.

Fedor Bech "Zum Wortschatz des Chemnitzer Urkundenbuchs." From the large collection of words we note Grimm, D. W., II 426 *bruelsing* = frischling, wie es in den Brül (= wiese) getrieben wird; Sanders, D. W., I 228 *bruelsing* from *bruch* = sumpf; Bech connects it with *brühen*, Low German *brojen* (Schiller-Lübben, I 427b). *Bechen swîn*, i. e. das zu Speck und Schinken bestimmte Schwein, incorrectly printed in Lexer's Handwörterbuch *beckenswîn* and translated by *bäckerschwein* (Nachträge, 46), cf. *bachen* in Lexer. *Derjenige*, pronoun, according to Grimm and Weigand not before the 16th century; Bech finds it in the 15th. *Durchaus*, adverb, Grimm, Wörterbuch, II 1583, not before the 16th century; Bech quotes it from the 15th. *Hern*, Grimm in W. III 52 says "es ist ein unverstand schon dem nominativ ein obliques *n* (h)ehrn, (h)ehren beizusetzen wie Bürger thut :

hierauf sprang (h)*ehren* Loth herbei  
mit brausen und mit schnarchen."

Bech shows this usage in documents of the 15th century (cf. Sanders, I 344a). B. continues with two minor communications "Vom Eichhorn als Wildpret," and "Das wort *tinne*." The first article furnishes Alwin Schulz, the writer of "Das höfische leben zur zeit der Minnesänger," with more material to enlarge in the next edition of his work, the list of the different kinds of game used at the table of prince and knight during the middle ages. The second communication maintains his reading *tinne* = schläfe, instead of *täme* = daumen, in F. Pfeiffer's "Arzneibüchern," II 4, as defended by Sprenger. The Kornenburg fragment which Blass published in the Germania (26, 380) seems to confirm *tinne* as the proper word.

Most mediaeval epics have received for years a close and scholarly attention. This attention, however, has not been uniformly spread over the whole field; favorites like the Nibelunge nôt and Kudrun have received more than their

fair share, other less conspicuous but perhaps as much in want of elucidation have certainly received less. It has struck us as remarkable, considering the connection of the Ortnit-Wolfdietrichsage with so many epics, how small a part of the work of philologists has been devoted to it. Friedrich Neumann in a paper, "Die Entwicklung der Ortnitdichtung und der Ortnitsage," contributes a searching analysis of the poem, which gives promise that the subject will be dealt with more frequently. He concludes that the Ortnit-Wolfdietrichsage originated in the combining of two independent subjects, Ortnit the dragon-slayer being a different personage from Ortnit "der Riuze" who sails beyond the sea. Soon after the taking of Tyros in the year 1124 a new version appears that makes Suders the capital of the enemy, and through the influence of the battles round Mons Tabor in 1217 a later poet substitutes Muntabüre for Suders, placing Alberich, heretofore of little import, as the central figure. The poet of our text mixes two versions, the older having Suders as the object of the expedition, the younger, Muntabüre. He tries to disguise the contradictions incident to this process, but does not succeed.

F. Vetter sends some minor communications, and Bartsch prints five folksongs of the XV century.

Felix Liebrecht pronounces favorably upon *Les littératures populaires de toutes les nations: Tome I. Littérature orale de la Haute Bretagne*, par Paul Sébillot, Paris, 1881; and Hermann Fischer reviews H. Paul's "Zur Nibelungenfrage," Halle, 1877, reprinted in Paul and Branne's *Beiträge*, Vol. III.

A folksong of the time of the Thirty Years' War on "Gustav Adolf's Tod," sent by F. Pfaff, and a communication from Bartsch regarding the ἀνὰ λῆ, ὄματα in the Nibelungen printed by B. Symons in his review in *Literaturblatt* No. 1, 1882, of B.'s *Nibelungen Wörterbuch*, close the second number.

In an announcement of W. H. Carpenter's "Grundriss der neuisländischen Grammatik," Leipzig, 1881, in the *Literaturblatt für germ. und roman. Philologie*, 1881, 2, Finnur Jonsson sharply criticised the glossary and reading matter accompanying the work (cf. *Amer. Journal of Philology*, II 5), and Byörn Magnussen Olsen now follows with an article, "Zur neuisländischen Grammatik," first in third number, in which he violently attacks the "Laut und Flexionslehre" of Carpenter's grammar. Olsen seems to us to have dealt with the book somewhat in a spirit of *revanche*. "Neben der allgemeinen (wissenschaftlichen) habe ich auch eine besondere persönliche Aufforderung, gegen dieses werk einspruch zu erheben" (des Pudels kern?). The book was written conjointly in Rykjavik, Iceland, by Olsen and Carpenter, but finally augmented and published in Germany by the latter. Olsen finds the "Flexionslehre"—the outlines of which he furnished entirely—intentionally changed and interpolated by awkward additions, and his communications were in many instances misunderstood or not understood at all by Carpenter. The sketch of the history of the language in the introduction of the work O. pronounces "aus ihrem zusammenhange losgerissene Literaturnotizen" which the author mainly copied from Vigfusson's Icelandic reader and Möbius' essay "Über die altnordische Sprache." A "Lautlehre," originally not intended for the work, was added by the author. It offers little of new matter, O. continues, but many errors, and as a rule the author plagiarises Gislason and Wimmer, whom he, however,

often misunderstands. "Sehr zu bedauern ist, dass der erste versuch, eine wirkliche neuisländische Grammatik zu schreiben, so ärmlich ausgefallen ist." But we pass from these personal compliments. That Carpenter's book needs corrections is acknowledged, we presume, by himself, and for this an unbiased, disinterested criticism is wanted. Olsen does not give it to us. With the knowledge of the importance to philology of a grammar of the living Icelandic tongue so long existing, it seems odd that we should so recently have only our first book on the subject.

A minor communication from R. Sprenger, "Alber von Regensburg und die Eneide," seems to establish the fact that Alber was acquainted with Veldecke's Eneide and the description of hell in that epic. A comparison of quoted passages from Alber's Tundalus and the Eneide shows a remarkable resemblance. We note the expression "Ein ovele nâgebûr," Eneide 3238; "Ein übel nâchgebûre," Kudrun, Strophe 650, 4. Sprenger thinks the Eneide probably prompted the saying in the Kudrun (cf. Martin, Kudrun).

The only text heretofore known of the poem "Wigamur" was the Wolfenbüttel MS of the end of the 16th century. Lately the Salzburg and Munich fragments were discovered. F. Keinz prints the Munich text and assigns it to the middle of the 13th century, not long after the writing of the original. This completes the publication of the known Wigamur MSS. The Wolfenbüttel MS was published by Büsching in the Deutsche Gedichte des Mittelalters, and the Salzburg fragments by R. M. Werner in the Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, XXIII 100.

Edzardi, in an article, "Fensalir und Vegtamskviða," dissents from S. Bugge's explanation of the word *meyjar* in the Vegtkv. 12, 5-8:

hverjar 'ru paer meyjar,  
er at muni gráta, etc.

Bugge finds the key in the Homeric *κούραι ἀλίου γέροντος*—the mermaids (*meyjar*) lament the death of Achilles—Baldur being Achilles. Edzardi discourages the tendency of explaining the northern sagas by Greek myths, as by such a process they are hardly ever reasoned out to any satisfactory issue. They may generally be interpreted much more simply from Germanic mythology. (We agree with E.) Edzardi makes *meyjar* to refer to Frigga's eyes, and illustrates this from the Wodan-Baldr myth. Corresponding to the passage in the Vegtkv. the Vsp. 34, 5 has:

"en Frigg um grét  
i *Fensolum*  
vá Valhallar."

Bugge explains *fensalir* = meersäle (hafsafir). Frigg i Fensolum = the nereide Thetis beneath the ocean. Edzardi here considers *fen* = teich, sumpf, and *fensalir* connected with the popular belief that certain swamps and ponds were the entrances to the abode of Holda (Frigga), the lower world.

C. M. Blass prints "Deutsche Randbemerkungen" of the 13th century, found with a Psalter at present in the city archives of Kornenburg, and Bartsch and F. Keinz supply similar matter from Erlangen and Munich libraries.



From it he draws the inference that Hartmann, and not one of his later imitators, really was the writer of the "2 Bûchlein." The time which is assigned to the origin of Konrad's poem contradicts the opinion which would place the authorship of the "2 Bûchlein" to another and later writer. S. thinks the change of the word *gewant* (v. 1681) to *gelant* (Lachmann) unnecessary, since the former perfectly suits the sense of the passage.

Felix Liebrecht reviews the 3d Vol. of Eugène Rolland's *Faune populaire de la France*, Paris, 1881, and the Miscellany contains a contribution from A. Lübben, "Zum Sachsenspiegel," in which he questions the assertion of Richard Schröder (No. 9 *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. roman. Philolog.*, 1880) "der text des Oldenburger Codex sei die niederdeutsche rückübersetzung eines hochdeutschen textes."

The fourth number opens with an article of Fedor Bech, "Zu dem Pariser Tagezeiten," in which he points out the passages in the work that were directly modeled after *Frauenlob*; and Edzardi has "Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der Eddalieder." In the 23d and 24th Vols. of the *Germania* the *Gripisspá* was treated by Edzardi. A further examination of the text has convinced him that in one place—Strophes 33-44 (Hilderbrand)—it is even more incomplete and perplexing than was generally supposed. E. prints the strophes in the order which he considers the original.

E. Steffenhagen furnishes a "Kieler Bruchstück aus Berthold's von Halle Demantin." The writing proves it to be of the 14th century, and the context corresponds to the verses 1287-1438 of Bartsch's complete edition.

Ferdinand Vetter follows with some minor communications, and C. v. Herdenberg prints a paper MS of the 15th century, "Die vier Temperamente."

A series of remarks and questions made by Otto Behagel, which, he says, were suggested to him by his edition of the "Heliand," will prove of great value for any future edition and the study of that work.

R. Sprenger reads Erec, 2265:

swaz aber im des gebrast  
(*das meinde* daz er was dâ gast:  
sîn lant was im verre),  
Artûs der herre  
gap im swaz er vor sprach.

*Meinen* has here the meaning of to *cause*. Thus it is also used by K. v. Heimesfurt, "Urstende," 113, 41:

"daz er des êrsten genas (mit dem tode fürs erste verschont blieb)  
*daz meinde* deiz was spâte."

A list of recent publications in the field of Germanic philology by the editor, Karl Bartsch; J. H. Gallée, of Utrecht; K. Gislason, of Copenhagen; K. F. Sodervall, of Lund, and an index to Vols. XXV-VII of the *Germania*, close the fourth number.

C. F. RADDATZ.

HERMES. 1882.

No. I.

E. Fabricius, of Strassburg, writes The Building-contract of Delos, C. I. G. 2266. This inscription is one of those first published by Chandler in 1763, and is now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. Recently there were found at Lebadea and Tegea important inscriptions dealing with kindred matters. Thus many new points of analogy have become available, and Fabricius has been prompted to discuss the Delian inscription anew. The time of the inscription may be gathered from the form of the letters and from other data; Fabricius assigns it to the latter part of the third century B. C., when Delos enjoyed autonomy.

The contract relates to the building of the floor of the temple of Apollo. The successful bidder for the contract, his bondsmen and the official witnesses to the contract are given, these latter being partly officials (the clerk of the council, the clerk of the *leporarioi* and of the market-masters), and partly private persons. This contract is preceded by a general outline of the conditions of the contract *per se* with appended legal points. Any unsuccessful bidder could bring a *δίκη ψεύδους* against the actual contractor, *i. e.* accuse him of malfeasance in the execution, fraud, etc. It seems that the compensation agreed upon was given to the contractor (*ἐργώνης*) in two instalments, ten per cent, being held back until the entire work was concluded. The commissioners, if they failed to make their payments on the date agreed upon, were bound to pay an *ἐπιφορά*, and the contractor likewise had to pay a fine for any tardiness. In accepting the completed work the commissioners were aided by the *ἀρχιτέκτων* who acted as their professional counsel and official expert.

C. Galland discusses interpolations in Arcadius, a late grammarian who drew largely on Herodian.

W. Dittenberger contributes notes on Greek noun-inflection. The form *ἰκπής* occurs in an Attic inscription of 394 B. C. This form D. believes to be *cf* *ἰκπής*, denying the claim that *ἰκπής* or *ἰκπέρ* are the prior inflection analogous forms from inscriptions.

discusses Die untergegangenen Ortschaften in Latium, basing his N. H. III 5, 68, 69. This list of communities mostly refers to their existence as civil corporations before the beginning of the 4th century; a few were razed by Sulla. Most of them were of the *Prisci* type. According to Mommsen, Pliny's information came from the old Roman list directly; probably he derived it through Varro's *Antiquitates*. The list as edited by Mommsen includes Ameriola, Amitinum, Ardea, Ariminum, Cameria, Collatia, Corniculum, Crustumium, Ficana, Fundanum, Pometium, Satricum, Scaptia, Tellena, Tifata.

discusses the Episode of Chryseis in Homer. The author of this somewhat of opinion that modern Homer-criticism is unduly barren, and it is to relieve this unproductiveness. According to Hinrichs, the artistic and chronological points has run its complete course. He thinks may still be done by verbal analysis. The return of Chryseis, according to Hinrichs, is the work of a wretched "Flickmeister."



This wooden person went to work in a manner worthy of a lazy and mechanical schoolboy; culling a phrase here and two words there, a couple of lines plundered from  $\gamma$ , some phrases and general situations filched outright from the hymn to the Pythian Apollo, also from  $\beta$ ,  $\vartheta$ ,  $\tau$ , and from more than a dozen different books of the Iliad. Hinrichs professes himself a disciple of Lachmann. That critic, indeed, considered this episode as "sehr geschickt," and "an sich vortrefflich," but Lachmann left much laborious detail to later workers. The whole paper seems to the reporter nebulous and unsatisfactory.

E. Petersen (Prague): Der Streit der Goetter (Athena and Poseidon) um Athen, discusses anew the St. Petersburg vase, and pronounces and explains his dissent from Robert's interpretation of it (Hermes, 1881, p. 60 sqq.).

C. Robert: Die angebliche Pyrrhosbüste der Uffizien und die iconographischen Publicationen des 16ten Jahrhunderts. In this archaeological discussion Robert produces some interesting notes which throw considerable light upon the later renaissance in Italy. The enthusiastic desire to identify portrait busts, Hermae, etc., with great men of old led to much falsification of inscriptions on the part of connoisseurs, collectors, authors and publishers. This became evident by inconsistency in successive publications of the same art-objects, by gross blunders of the falsifiers, and by covert admissions of authors and publishers. The Anthology very generally served as the source from which were drawn the epigrams put on bases.

F. Blass: Neue Papyrus-fragmente im Aegyptischen Museum zu Berlin. B. publishes and comments upon the second of these Greek papyri found in the Fayûm. It is exceedingly fragmentary; the date is of the V century B. C. It contains four articles, all of which pertain to and explain the text of Demosthenes contra Aristocratem, *e. g.* on Miltokythes, the Spartan mora,  $\delta \kappa \alpha \tau \omega \theta \epsilon \nu \nu \acute{o} \mu \circ \varsigma$ . Harpocraton, as Blass shows by parallel quotation, contains the gist and often the words of these alphabetical scholia, but much more briefly abstracted. Blass makes some sensible suggestions as to the probable history and the successive abstraction and condensation of scholia, as in the present case. The probable fountainhead was a regular commentary rather than Atticist collections.

In the Miscellen there occur notes by H. Giske, Zu den Chiliaden des Tzetzes; Th. Mommsen, Zu Ammian; A. Gemoll, Emendationen zu der Hyginischen Lagerbeschreibung; F. Gustafson, ad Ciceronis Tusculanas Disputationes conjecturae XII; Ed. Woelfflin, Satura Critica.

## No. II.

P. Pulch, of Strassburg, prints an interesting study, Zu Eudocia, proving that the famous *Violarium* ( $\text{Ἰωλιά}$ ) of the learned Byzantine Empress (flor. circa 1070 A. D.) is really a compilation made by Constantinus Palaeopappa, a Cretan monk, who had been an inmate of a monastery on Mt. Athos. He and other Greek calligraphers and copyists of that time found generous employment at Paris in the time of Henry II, husband of Catherine of Medicis, and of the Cardinal of Lorraine, also a distinguished patron of such men. The paper is an interesting contribution to the history of classic philology in the XVI century. [See A. J. P. III 489.]



R. Foerster (Kiel): Achilles and Polyxena, two unedited declamations of Choricus. Choricus was a noted professor of rhetoric and literature in the age of Justinian.<sup>1</sup> The two pieces edited by Foerster are from a MS of the National Library of Madrid. Foerster edits the text with many emendations; these, however, are generally very palpable, as the copyist of the MS appears to have been very ignorant of Greek. Each declamation is preceded by an hypothesis and *θεωρία* which betoken the practical teacher of rhetoric.

Choricus appears to have been thoroughly imbued with Demosthenes, and he maintains very pure Atticism in construction and vocabulary; a few phrases are direct reminiscences, *e. g.* p. 212, l. 22 *συγκεκροτημένος τὰ τοῦ πολέμου* (from Dem. XXIII 3). In poetical phrases he rarely indulges, *e. g.* *φλόγα προσάγειν*, p. 212, l. 25; *ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ*, p. 231, l. 30. Certain phrases are derived from Platonic and Aristotelian vocabulary, as *ψυχαγωγεῖν*, *συλλογίζεσθαι*. The argument is wrought out with great clearness and with as much earnestness as such a subject-matter would admit. Choricus exhibits an excellent faculty of psychological analysis, although this is sometimes brought forward too didactically, not in the proper dramatic manner.

I. Schmidt (Halle) discusses the MSS of Serenus Sammonicus.

Gardthausen: Ursicinus and the Inscription of Dojan. This inscription (edited by Mommsen, C. I. L. III 6159) records a victory over the Goths; spelling and antiquarian detail point to the IV century A. D. Gardthausen in the present paper endeavors to specify dates and persons, assigning the inscription to Constantinus II, son of Constantine the Great.

Vahlen: Varia; Exegetical notes on passages in Cicero, Ovid, Vergil, Seneca, Plautus. This distinguished successor of Haupt and Lachmann shows a strong vein of conservatism in his dealing with texts. He hesitates to leap from the notation of difficulty to the utterance of condemnation. He is careful to exhaust the ranges of parallel literature, and he often uses the mild remedy of a change in punctuation. His Latin, generally limpid and dispassionate, becomes somewhat ruffled when dealing with that band of younger Ritschelians who are continuing their master's edition of Plautus. He imputes to them violent and subjective practices and returns some of their strictures with interest. Schoell, in bracketing Plaut. Trucul. I 1, 60, had remarked of Vahlen "novo igitur exemplo V. ostendit audaciorem esse neminem quam criticum iusto timidiorem." To which V. replies "Poteram respondere ut illa: ὡς σοφός. Sed nolo cavillari hominem quem auguror paullatim ultro desitutum mirari si multa quae ipsi nunc sunt certissima, ab aliis aut falsa habebuntur, aut dubia admodum." On p. 268 V. says "admonemur, ne, si qua in veterum libris a nostra dicendi consuetudine abhorrent, ne veteribus quidem potuisse placere confidentius affirmemus." Vahlen's method while avoiding specious brilliancy would seem to be more apt to make thorough scholars.

K. Lincke (Jena): Zur Xenophonkritik. This elaborate and somewhat rambling paper sets forth the theory that many passages in Xenophon's Anabasis are not late interpolations, but additions, probably, by the first editor or some one near to Xenophon. Of course there are additions of grosser and quite

<sup>1</sup> See American Journal of Philology, I 79.

palpable sort, as the summaries at the beginning of books II, III, IV, V and VII, also the general summary of tribes and nations at the end of the *Anabasis*. In many of his bracketings, Lincke reaffirms the critical judgment of Cobet, Schenkel, Krueger and others. A typical addition of such early addition, according to L., is the note on Apollo and Marsyas, *Anab.* I 2, 8. Here the style, too, serves L. as a handle for his condemnation, there being a series of monotonous, poorly connected data. L. also objects to the use of *σοφία* for musical skill. Lincke's paper may prove very handy for its presentation of a conspectus of doubtful or difficult passages in the *Anabasis*. At the same time one cannot help feeling that the critic cast around for more material after the façade of his critical stricture was completed. This is the impression produced by his strictures on III 4, 7 sqq. (Larisa and Mespila); where slight difficulties are stretched considerably, and where his comments on points of detail seem to have been biased in advance by his general theory. In conclusion, L. applies his theory of *early additions* to the *Cynegeticus*.<sup>1</sup> That book, according to Lincke, was not indeed written by Xenophon when a young man, but edited after his death by a young man with a young man's additions, such as the heavy mythological embellishment of the preface, etc.

The minor papers of this number are notes, by Hirzel on the Democritean Diotimos; by P. Stengel on Libations of wine in connection with burnt offerings; by A. Piccolomini, *De loco quodam vitae Euripidis*; and Th. Kock, A reply to van Herwerden on *Aristoph. Ran.* 548.

E. G. SIHLER.

---

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. 1882. III and IV Heft.

1. In continuation of Flügel's account of 'Abd al-ghānī's third and first journeys (*Zeitschrift*, 16, 651), J. Gildemeister gives extracts from his second journey, from Damascus to Jerusalem, made A. D. 1690. The interest of these travels lies in the geographical notices, and in the description of Moslem sacred places in and around Jerusalem. The author travelled in state, with a retinue of pupils, and was everywhere, as a great scholar, honorably received, and all means of obtaining information were placed at his disposal. His report gives a curious picture of the Moslem religious ideas of the day, which, however, seem not to differ greatly from what we now find in the East. With the Arabic devotion to names 'Abd al-ghānī begins his work with a list of the names of Jerusalem, eighteen in number, most of them from the Hebrew, with various distortions of form, as Babush for Yabus (Jebus), though this may be a scribal error. Perhaps the most valuable historical statement of the book is the account of the Haram (described by other Moslem pilgrims also), with its mosques, domes, and graves of the patriarchs. The existence of two rival graves of Moses occasions our traveller some embarrassment, but he takes refuge in the reflection that bodies are sometimes removed from one grave to another. The poetry scattered freely through the book Gildemeister pronounces to be generally poor.

<sup>1</sup> See *American Journal of Philology*, III 199.

2. Professor Bacher's article on "Abulwalid Ibn Janāḥ and the modern Hebrew poetry," cites a number of poetical quotations from Ibn Janāḥ's Hebrew-Arabic Dictionary, giving the names of the poets (these are of two classes, the liturgical or Paritanim or Piut-poets (ποίησις), and the non-liturgical), and illustrating the new forms and meanings of words which they employ. In this late poetry is found not only a considerable widening in the significations of biblical words, but also free departure from the masoretic rules of punctuation, and Abulwalid finds occasion to go into discussions like those of which the Arabic grammarians are so fond; thus there is a defence of נֶעַל and קָרַב as stat. const. of נֶעַל and קָרַב, and of the preposition עֲבוֹר, used instead of the fuller form בַּעֲבוֹר. Among words used in non-biblical senses may be mentioned חֵן (found in Old Testament only in Job xli 4, in sense of "grace, comeliness"), which the Piut-poets employ in the sense "discourse," taking it from דַּחַן, first as "prayer," and then as speech in general. For another biblical hapaxlegomenon, שָׁנֵן (Ps. lxviii 18), properly "repetition," we find in the Paitanim the rendering that the King James English Version has adopted, "angels," which was, apparently, the generally accepted signification among the later Jews (so Saadia and the Targum). The old versions all stumble at the word, twisting it in various ways, and the Jewish interpreters seem to have taken the signification "angels" by a simple *tour de force* from the context. Bacher accompanies his citations with instructive critical remarks and references to Jewish authorities.

3. In reply to Dr. Nager's article (see the Journal II 7) Dr. Fürst defends his interpretation of *Azkara* and *Shem Hammephorash* ("the distinctly pronounced tetragrammaton") by an examination of various passages of the Talmud in which they occur. There is no doubt that the verb פָּרַשׁ (in Pael) is used in the sense of "distinctly or expressly pronouncing the divine name," and that the prohibition of such pronunciation extended only to the name יְהוָה. In regard to אֲזָכְרָה the question is whether it is used of other divine names than the tetragrammaton, to which Dr. Fürst's answer (well supported by citations) is that in later times when the designation *Shem Hammephorash* had been generally adopted, and the original signification of *Azkara* had been forgotten, the latter was used of the other divine names, which are included in the category כִּנּוּיִם "cognomina."

4. Franz Praetorius expresses the opinion that the Šafa alphabet contains at least 25 letters, instead of 23, as Halévy holds (Journ. As., VII series, vols. 10 and 17), but thinks it impossible to speak with confidence on this point till the inscriptions have been more certainly deciphered.

Book Notices. 1. Nöldeke's highly commendatory reviews of Socin's Texts of modern Aramaic dialects from Urmia to Mosul, and of W. Wright's edition of the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite are characterized by his usual richness of text-critical, grammatical, historical, and geographical remark, too detailed to be given here; it may be mentioned that he prefers the spelling Ōrhāi (later Ūrhōi) to Wright's Ōrhāi or Ūrhāi (Edessa). Having better material at his disposal, Wright has been able to produce a correcter edition of Joshua than Martin, and so to make accessible the contents of this valuable chronicle,

whose date is given by Wright and Nöldeke as A. D. 507. 2. Kautzsch gives a detailed statement of the contents of Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1881 and first number of 1882), article by article, with critical characterization of the positions of the various contributors. His verdict is in general favorable, but he expresses the hope that the new Journal will not become merely the mouthpiece of one critical school (namely, that represented by Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others), but will number among its contributors defenders of all existing tendencies. Among the most noteworthy of the articles which have up to this time appeared in the *Zeitschrift* are Stade's on Zech. ix-xiv, which prophecy he assigns to the Greek period, and Giesebrecht's examination of the language of the Hexateuch in order to determine whether the linguistic phenomena permit or forbid the assignment of the Priest-Codex or Elohist to the period B. C. 620-450. His lexicographical result (herein he continues Ryssel's work) is as follows: Of the characteristic words of the PC there are found in the literature up to B. C. 700 at most 28, of which 12 are in Isaiah, Micah, Hosea, Amos; while there are 58 in Jeremiah and Lamentations, 29 in Deuteronomy, 72 in the exilian Isaiah, 192 in Ezekiel, over 80 in Job and Proverbs, 229 in Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, 11 in Judges, 6 in Samuel, 31 in Kings. This striking result is entitled to careful attention from the opponents of the post-exilian date of the Elohist. 3. Nestle has notices of Hoffmann's edition of the Syrian account of Julian the Apostate, and of Baethgen's edition and translation of the Syriac Grammar of Mar Elias of Tirhan. The latter is the only printed original East-Syrian grammar, and also the oldest surviving work that can make pretensions to the name of a Syriac grammar, its date being about A. D. 1000. 4. The Chinese grammar of Georg von der Gabelentz (Leipzig, 1881) is declared by Grube to be an epoch-making book. In ZDMG 32, 601 v. d. Gabelentz described what he thought to be the proper way of treating Chinese grammar, and his present work is intended to be an illustration of the principles there laid down. For the first time, says Grube, we here have the study of the Chinese language emancipated from the methods of the Latin grammars, and put on the basis of an examination of the facts themselves. The author calls in question (as Lepsius had already done in 1861) the original monosyllabism of the Chinese tongue, and the reviewer adds that he himself has shown the impossibility of this supposed original monosyllabism by a comparison between the Chinese and the Tibetan and related languages, in his essay, *Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des Chinesischen*, Leipzig, 1881. 5. The contents of Ignatius Goldziher's work on Islam (unfortunately written in Hungarian, Budapest, 1881) are described by Bacher as being "rich and interesting." The six chapters treat of: The religion of the desert and of Islam; The traditions of Islam; Saint-worship, and the remains of older religions; Buildings, in connection with the Muhammedan conception of the world; Muhammedan University life; Incorrect opinions respecting Islam. Goldziher takes the field against Sprenger and others, and maintains that Islam is not in any sense a development of the Arabian national thought, but is, on the contrary, a complete denial and reversal of all the habits and tendencies of the people. This is doubtless an exaggeration of one side of the phenomenon, but has its rights over against similar exaggerations of the other side.

At the request of the editors of the *Zeitschrift*, Dr. H. Guthe describes his work on the Siloam inscription, and gives a Hebrew transliteration, German translation, and commentary, with a photograph of his gypsum cast. The transliteration is as follows (the stars represent illegible letters, those in parenthesis-marks are not quite certain, those in square brackets are supplied):

- 1 \* \* הנקבה · וזה · היה · דבר · הנקבה · בעור  
 2 הגרון · אש · אל · רעו · ובעור · שלש · אמת · לה(ג) · \* \* \* \* \* קל · (א)ש · ק  
 3 (ר)א · אל · רעו · כי · הית · זרה · בצר · מימן · (ו)מ · \* \* \* (אל) · ובים · ה  
 4 נקבה · הנו · ההצנב · אש · לקרת · רעו · גרון · על · (ג)רון · וילכו ·  
 5 המים · מן · המוצא · אל · הנרכה · במאתים · (ו)אלף · אמה · ומ(א)  
 6 ת · אמה · היה · (ג)כה · הצ(ר) · על · ראש · החצבי(ם)

The translation of Professor E. Kautzsch, slightly modified by Guthe, is as follows: 1. "The cut [is finished]. And this was the manner of the cut. While [they were] still [swinging] 2. the picks one toward the other, and while there were yet three cubits to [cut through], [there was heard] the voice of one who cal- 3. led to another, for there was a cleft (?) in the rock on (or from) the south [and on (or from) the north]. And on the day of the 4. cut the masons struck one toward the other; pick against pick, and there came 5. the water from the spring to the pool 1200 cubits, and two hun- 6. dred cubits was the height of the rock above the heads of the masons." The readings of the photograph are in some cases nearly or quite illegible where Dr. Guthe expresses no doubt; in such cases he must have got his idea of the reading from the inscription itself, and failed to make a complete transfer on his cast. Nevertheless, we are under great obligation to him for the perseverance and skill which he has shown in procuring and publishing the cast. The only new words in the inscription are נקבה and זרה, of which the former is clear (from נקב "to pierce"). No satisfactory sense has been found for זרה. Of known Semitic stems we could think only of זור, which in Hebrew signifies only "to boil, be proud," but in Arabic means to "increase, be over and above, remain," whence the noun would signify "a remaining part, or an attached part," which, however, yields no clear sense. Guthe and others assume the sense "cleft, fissure," from what they think the necessity of the connection, but there seems to be no etymological basis for this signification, and it must remain at best doubtful. The grounds for the assumption of the bracketed words will appear from the connection. The letters of the inscription are nearly identical in form with those of the Mesha-stone (9th century B. C.) except the Aleph, which is like the Aleph of the Eshmunazar-inscription (4th century B. C.). From a comparison with II Chron. xxxii 30, Guthe (regarding Isa. viii 6 as not decisive) assigns the tunnel and the inscription to the time of Hezekiah, latter part of 8th century B. C.

Other articles in this number are: On the *Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra*, by P. v. Bradke, proof that the *Mānava* belongs to the *Māitrāyaṇī-Çākhā*, with remark that the transition from the Vedic prose to the classic metrical prose was made through the epic poetry; Extract from the poems of the Tatar sage Nāṣir Chusran, by Prof. Dr. Hermann Ethé; Specimens from various Indian poets, by Theodor Aufrecht; On the *Ashi-Yasht* of the *Avesta*, by Chr. Bartholomae; On *Avestan* text-criticism, by F. Spiegel; *Avestan* studies, by C. de Harlez; and several short articles.

C. H. Toy.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. 1882.

No. 2. August-September (No. 1 contains the Annual Report, by Renan).

1. Senart continues his studies of the inscriptions of Piyadasi (see the Journal, No. 7).

2. The Sanskrit inscriptions, collected in Camboge by M. Aymonier, Representative of the French Protectorate, and sent by him to the Asiatic Society at Paris, were submitted for examination to a committee consisting of Messrs. Barth, Bergaigne and Senart, who give a detailed report of the contents, and warmly commend Aymonier's work. Bergaigne points out the evidence furnished by the inscriptions of the missionary activity of Brahmanism, which, indeed, prepared the way for Buddhism; Brahmanism, says Barth elsewhere, failed to penetrate anterior Asia not from lack of the proselyting spirit, but by reason of the barriers opposed to its progress by more compact religions, vigorous political organizations, and national culture superior to its own. Barth adds annotated translations of two of the inscriptions (see the Journal, No. 11).

3. M. Arthur Amiaud gives an improved translation of the non-Semitic inscription of Hammurabi (Cuneiform Ins. of West. Asia, 4, 15, 1) for the purpose of putting alongside of it an Assyrian translation which he has taken almost wholly from the Semitic inscriptions of the same king Hammurabi, and showing the striking correspondence that exists between the composition of the former and that of the latter. He declares that there is a similar correspondence in all the non-Semitic inscriptions of the five first plates of the W. A. I. He concludes that if the authors of the inscriptions wrote in two different languages, it seems at least that they thought in only one. He says nothing further on this point, but apparently reserves his more explicit statement for another article.

Book Notices. There are highly commendatory notices of Jäschke's Tibetan-English Dictionary (London, 1881) by Feer, and of de Harlez's Pehlvi Manual (Paris, 1880) by de Dillon. Siouffi, French vice-consul at Mosul, communicates some very curious creation-legends of the Yezidis, together with an account of their present customs.

No. 3 of the Journal, containing the index to the Seventh Series, has not yet appeared.

1883. No. 1, January (beginning of the Eighth Series).

1. Maspero gives text and translation of the love-songs of the Turin papyrus, and the papyrus Harris 500, and points out certain resemblances between them and the Old Testament Song of Songs.

2. Clément Huart, Interpreter of the French Embassy at Constantinople, gives a long list of Arabic words and expressions peculiar to the Damascus dialect, supplementing the Arabic-French dictionary of CuChe, and Dozy's Supplement to Arabic dictionaries. The strange forms *'arjini*, *warjini*, *farjini*, all meaning "cause me to see," he derives from the ordinary stem *ra'd* "to see," in which the middle radical Alif has been changed into *j*, with prefixing of the conjunctions *wa* and *fa*.

C. H. Toy.



## ΜΝΗΜΟΣΥΝΗ, Vol X, Part III.

The first article (pp. 225-38) of this number is by Cobet, containing criticisms on Appian, *de bellis civilibus*. He places first in parallel columns a passage which occurs substantially in the same terms in IV 58 and III 57; "hunc locum ex nescio quo historico descriptum quum semel Appianus apposuisset eius rei immemor eundem iterum in rem suam convertit." Cobet shows that errors have been introduced into the later quotation which do not occur in the earlier. V 92, 28: ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ὀπλίτας ὀλέσσειν ἐπιβήσας ἐς Σικελίαν περαιοῦν. "Debebat ἐπιβιβάσας scribere et ἐπέβησα Homero et Herodoto relinquere. Sed apud sequiores πάντα ῥήματα ἦν ὁμοῦ neque in quoquam erat ὁ νοῦς ὁ διακοσμήσων." V 101, 4: τοῖς προφύλαξι τῶν ναυπηγουμένων Καίσαρι πῶν οἷα σκηπτὸς ἈΦΑΝΩΣ ἐμπίπτων, "ecquid absurdius est quam σκηπτὸς ἀφανῶς ἐμπίπτων, ut apud iocosum poetam in rebus manifesto absurdis ludentem: *le tonnerre en silence Par des éclairs obscuri annonçait sa présence?* Exime duas literulas et erit ἈΦΝΩ, quod Appianus passim usurpat pro *ὑπερβόλαι*, *negotinato*." IV 94, 33: post caedem Caesaris αὐτίκα ἡ βουλὴ τὴν κοινὴν γνώμην ἐξέθηκε σαφῶς μὲν ὅτι καὶ γέρα τυραννοκτονικὰ ἐψηφίζοντο εἶναι, ἐπισχόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ Ἀντωνίου κατ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀΤΑΡΑΞΙΑΣ. "Senatus intersectoribus Caesaris praemia decernere volebat, sed retinuit eos Antonius. Retinuit autem κατ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας. Quid tandem est κατ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας? Nihil prorsus. Interpres: *sed revocati ab eo consilio patres per Antonium astute dissimulantem quas excitaturus esset turbas*. Vides interpretem quoque astute dissimulare se ea verba non intelligere." Lenissima emendatio claram lucem afferet. Rescribe κατ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀΠΡΑΞΙΑΣ. Ἀπραξία est *iustitium* quum neque cum populo neque cum patribus quidquam recte agi posset eoque praetextu usus Antonius prohibuit quo minus patres quidquam decernerent." He shows however that Appian's usual word for *iustitium* is ἀργία; *iustitium indicere* = ἀργίας προγράφειν; *iustitium remittere* = ἀργίας ἀναυπεῖν or βαστάζειν. Cobet closes these notes with some general remarks on the style of Appian. "Utitur Appianus oratione simplici et incompta et perspicua ad intelligendum. Totus in rebus verba eadem de iisdem solet ponere inops magis quam copiosus et minime sectatur τὴν καλλιπέειαν multorum naufragiis infamem scopulum . . . Non vitat vitiosam vulgi συνήθειαν et horum fere incuriosus ac negligens nonnumquam in mirificos errores se induit. Auxerat, ut eruditi omnes, dicendi copiam assidua lectione Veterum, et saepe pellucet Thucydidis dictio, saepe Demosthenis, saepissime omnium Herodotea. Non putide haec et pueriliter imitatur sed quae longo usu imbiberat utitur pro suis." This statement is supported by many citations which establish each point; and he says at the end: "Complura: genere hoc ex Herodoti et Appiani comparatione colligi possunt, quam niorum ingenio et industriae commendo."

page 239, with the heading ἈΔΙΑΝΟΗΤΑ Latina et Gallica, Cobet gives

mistake would be mediated by the late and rare form ΑΦΝΩΣ.—B. L. G.  
 passage occurs in a speech of Cassius where he narrates the events that followed upon death. For my part, I cannot see the difficulty of κατ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας in view of his words (Vit. Anton. c. 14): ἐξήκει τῆς βουλῆς λαμπρότατος ἀνδρῶν ὁ Ἀντώνιος καὶ δοκῶν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον καὶ πράγματα δυσκολία ἔχοντα καὶ ταραχὰς οὐ τὰς οὐκ ἐμφανέστατα κεχρησθαι καὶ πολιτικώτατα. A. pretended to be opposed to all. Besides, how can ὑπόκρισις be used as equivalent to σκῆψις or πρόφασις?—B. L. G.

M. Bréal's interpretation 'antiquissimae, ut perhibent, inscriptionis,' cited in this Journal, Vol. III, p. 107; and exclaims: "ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τῆς λεπτότητος τῶν φρενῶν. Quam suaviter in sinu ridebit scurra Romanus, qui hanc nugatorium inscriptionem ioci causa de suo commentus est." For Cobet's own view of it see p. 246 of the same volume.

The next article (pp. 240-46) is by J. Van Der Vliet, on passages in the letters of Seneca. His suggestions are often ingenious and probable; but some of the changes proposed have been already adopted by the Editors; e. g. that on Ep. 50, §2.

Next, K. G. P. Schwartz (pp. 247-50) gives notes 'ad Platonem et Lucianum.' The only passage of Plato touched upon is Phaed. 62a, which he proposes to emend by inserting the spaced words: καὶ οὐδέποτε τυγχάνει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰλλα, ἐστὶν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον ὢν ἀλλῶς τε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν. This would suit the sense very well, but is unnecessary if we understand the preceding τοῦτο to mean τὸ μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀποκτινύναι, and not with M. Schwartz simply τὸ αὐτὸν ἐαυτὸν ἀποκτινύναι.

We have then emendations proposed for some thirty passages of Lucian. Only one can be quoted. "*Bis Accusatus* c. 3, τοσαύτας ἐώλων δίκας φυλάττομεν . . . καὶ μάλιστα ὀπόσαι τὰς ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχνας πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τινὰς ξυνέστησαν. Sine dubio corrigendum ταῖς ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχναις. Notissima locutio est δίκη μοι συνίσταται πρὸς τινα."

Cobet next (pp. 251-57) contributes some notes on Galen. He illustrates the condition of his MSS by comparing quotations made by Galen from Hdt. II 36 and Ar. Av. 471 with the texts as they appear in our editions. Galen's own rule as to style is quoted; VI, p. 579: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὕτως ἐχρησάμην ὥς οἱ νῦν ἄνθρωποι χρῶνται, βέλτιον ἡγούμενος εἶναι διδάξαι σαφῶς τὰ πράγματα τοῦ παλαιῶς ἀττικίζειν. "Athenienses Galeni aetate utebantur τῇ κοινῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων συνηθείᾳ . . . sed in tali re παλαιῶς addi non solet, quia omnes sciebant ἀττικίζειν non nisi de vetere lingua Attica usurpari." A passage in VII, p. 291, is quoted to justify the substitution of κάθηφαγίας for καὶ γυμνασίων in Ar. Nub. 417, "Absurdum est ἀπέχει γυμνασίων, in quo nulla inest luxuriae notio. Apud Diogenem Laertium, ubi hic versus laudatur, pro γυμνασίων legitur ἀδηφαγίας, quod unice verum esse et Aristophani reddendum ratio demonstrat et confirmat locus Galeni." Several passages are quoted simply for their interest: e. g. VIII, p. 148: πυνθόμενος τῷ Ἀρχιγένοι τι γεγράφθαι βιβλίον ἐνθα διδάσκει μνήμης βεβλαμμένης ἀνάκτησιν, εὐθέως περιῆλθον ἀπάσας μὲν τὰς βιβλιοθήκας, ἅπαντας δὲ τοὺς βιβλιοπώλας, ἅπαντας δὲ οὓς ἤδειν ἰατροὺς ἐσπονδακότας περὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τὰνδρὸς εἰπορῆσαι τοῦ βιβλίου προηρημένος. VIII, p. 151: ὥς ἐγωγε καὶ νῦν θεῶμαι ΚΑΤΑ τὰς τῶν νοσοῦντων ἐπισκέψεις τοὺς ἰατροὺς ἐν τῇ κοινολογίᾳ πυνθανομένους ἀλλήλων κατὰ τίνα λόγον τόδε βοήθημα πρὸ τοῦδε συνεβούλευσαν. "Optima haec erat et utilissima medicorum consuetudo, sed vitium est in verbis: κατὰ τὰς τῶν νοσοῦντων ἐπισκέψεις. Interpres vertit ut debuit, *inter visitandum aegros*. Sed quicumque sentit haec *coram aegrotantibus* agi non potuisse rescribito MEτὰ τὰς τῶν νοσοῦντων ἐπισκέψεις." "Est operae pretium videre quam alto supercilio Graeci linguas barbarorum contemnerent. Paullo ante Galenus scribit (VIII, p. 585) ἐὰν προσέχῃς τὸν νοῦν ταῖς φωναῖς τῶν βαρβάρων διαλέκτων εἰσὴ σαφῶς τὰς μὲν ταῖς τῶν συνῶν, τὰς δὲ ταῖς τῶν βατράχων ἢ κολοιῶν ἢ κοράκων ἐοικυίας. Eiusdem-



modi est quod Julianus scribit de poetis trans Rhenum pag. 337d: *ἰθαασόμενον . . . τοὺς ὑπὲρ τὸν Ῥῆνον βαρβάρους ἄγρια μέλη λέξει πεποιημένα παραπλοῖα τοῖς κρωγμοῖς τῶν τραχὺ βοῶντων ὀρνίθων φέροντας.*"

In the next article (pp. 258-89) Naber continues his *Euripidea*. In Ion. 54, he proposes *θρυγοφύλακα* for *χρυσοφύλακα*, which he supports by comparing vv. 315 and 414, explaining *θρυγός* to be 'deauratum saeptum saxis structum quo, adytum templi circumclusum erat.' In 304 he writes *φοῖβω ζυγῆναι* for *μυγῆναι*, asserting that in the Tragic dialect the rule of ordinary Attic speech must hold by which *μύννται ὁ ἀνὴρ τῇ γυναικί, οὐχ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί*, though he is aware that the distinction is unknown to Homer, Hesiod, or Pindar. In 506, *οὐτ' ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὐτε λόγους φάτιν διόν*, he feels the difficulty that has troubled others, that *λόγους* expresses the time of gossip too vaguely to be properly contrasted with *κερκίσιν*. 'Quodnam praeterea tempus habent virgines, quod amicis confabulationibus dare possunt? Dum lavandria, uti arbitror, siccant ad solem. Vide modo Hippol. 125. Hinc conieci *οὐτ' ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὐτε πλυνοῖς*.' In Helen. 262, *ἐξαλειφθεῖς ὡς ὀγαλμα* is objected to as unintelligible. 'Solentne decorum signa *ἐξαλειφθῆναι*? Cur? Quando? Quomodo?' Then taking a hint from Plat. Sympos. 215b where Alcibiades compares Socrates to one of those Sileni, *οἱ δίχα διοικθέντες φαίνονται ἐνδοθεν ἀγάλματα ἔχοντες θεῶν*, he conjectures that Helen said

*εἰθ' ἐξανοιχθεῖς ὡς ὀγαλμ', αἰθρὶς πάλιν  
αἰσίων εἶδος ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ λαβόν.*

'Quid mirum, si Euripides incidit in eandem comparisonem, in quam postea Plato? Quamquam Plato melius, nam turpis Silenus interdum Helenam intus celat, sed formosa Helena non celat Silenum.' He further argues that *ὀγαλμα* means always a sculptured figure, not a picture. On Hel. 1590 he writes: 'Nondum expedire potuerunt viri docti *πάλιν πλέωμεν Ναξίαν* κέλευε σὺ. Codex habet *ἀξίαν*, cui superscriptum *να*, unde *Ναξίαν* in Aldinam fluxit. Scribit Hermannus *ἀξιώ*, Paleius *τί νῦν πλέωμεν Ναυπλίαν*, Badhamus *ἀντίαν*: sed haec desperantium sunt conamina. Emendandum: *πάλιν πλέωμεν δεξιὰν κέλευε σὺ*. Tantulum vitium omnes latuisse! Nec potero fortasse excitare locum ubi hoc legitur *δεξιὰν κέλευε*, sed quum Aristophanes dixerit: *ὁρθὴν κέλευε* ἢ τὸ φαίνεται, nihil est cur dubitemus an recte dicatur *δεξιὰν κέλευε*.' In on the Bacchae he speaks of the edition of Wecklein as very useful to unde praeterea in mea librorum penuria cognoscere potui quid viri docti c tragoediam explanandam attulissent.' Among other books Wecklein o a dissertation by Middendorf, 'qui in observationibus ad hanc fabulam ginis refutavit quae Boeckhius, quo erat ingenti acumine, persecutus per paginas triginta,' in regard to the question whether the younger ies had any hand in bringing about the existing condition of this play. em Middendorffo careo uti et aliis quam plurimis, quos minime con sed quos comparare mihi non potui, quia bibliotheca Amstelodamensis latinis et Graecis haud ita opipare instructa est, neque sacculus meus ad omnia. Leidensis bibliotheca mihi quaedam commodavit: etiam rdeno nonnulla debeo; sed Middendorffius in hanc urbem palorum et

the critic forgotten Kallimachos, Lavacr. Palladis, 13? See Müller, Archaeol. der 69.—B. L. G.

paludum nondum advolavit.' Naber's observations on this play and on the Iph. T., Iph. Aul. and Cyclops are always entertaining and sometimes helpful. But he is occasionally very perverse. On Bacch. 259: εἰ μὴ σε γῆρας πολὺν ἐξερμήνετο | καθῆσ' ἂν ἐν βάκχαισι δέσμιος μέσαις, he says 'praefero optativum καθῆ' ἂν. *Sederes, non sedisses*;' and he argues, Bacch. 1065, that for κατήγεν, ἤγεν, ἤγεν εἰς μέλαν πέδον we should read κατήγεν ἡρέμ' ἡρέμ'.

The next article (pp. 290-94) contains Platonic notes by Dr. Badham, chiefly on the Philebus; but none of them are available for this notice.

J. J. Cornelissen (pp. 295-300) follows with notes on Petronius. One or two of them may be quoted. §4, 'parentes obiurgatione digni sunt, qui nolunt liberos suos severa lege perficere. Legendum est *producere*, i. e. educare ut est apud Plaut. Asin. III 1, 40; Ter. Adelph. III 2, 16; Juvenal, Sat. 14, 228.' §80, 'fulminatus hac pronuntiatione, sic ut eram, sine gladio in lectulum decidi, et attulissem mihi damnatas [Buech. damnatus] manus, si non inimici victoriae invidissem. Absurde legitur *sine gladio*, nam neque si sine gladio in lectulum Encolpius decidisset, mortis sibi conciscendae consilium iniisset et supra narravit, postquam Ascyrtos gladium parricidali manu strinxerit, se idem fecisse; legendum igitur, *sicut eram, stricto gladio*.'

D. L. Van Stegeren follows (pp. 301-08) with *Varia Critica*, chiefly on Plutarch. In Plut. Cim. 13, ἵππου μὲν δρόμον αἰετῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπέχειν θαλάττης, Cobet rightly inserts ἡμέρας, comparing Dem. 19, 273. But ἵππειος δρόμος or ἵππικὸν διάστημα was probably a recognized distance. Cf. Sol. 23: νόμον ἐγραψεν ὅπου μὲν ἐστὶ δημόσιον φρέαρ ἐντὸς ἵππικῶν χρῆσθαι τούτῳ· τὸ δὲ ἵππικὸν διάστημα τεσσάρων ἢν σταδίων, and this is confirmed by other quotations. Fault is found with Cobet, who has said "ut enim in bello, sic in grammatica nihil contemni oportet, nec quisquam qui minuta haec spreverit, unquam facit in re critica operae pretium," that he never applies crasis to τὰ ὅπλα. If the passages in Aristophanes where the words are found contracted, and other analogical ones, do not establish the rule, consider that the words 'apud omnes Graecos in usu fuisse ob παράγγελμα militare. Solent enim haec iussa et παραγγέλματα omni tempore et apud omnes populos per ipsam rei naturam esse et brevissima et maxime perspicua. Credasne igitur, ut hoc utar, in Anabasi VII 1, 22 in tumultu militari ad Byzantium Xenophontem languida illa παρεγγυῆσαι, θέσθε τὰ ὅπλα? imo iussit, puto, θέσθε θῶπλα . . . ad arma apud ipsum Xenophontem est εἰς θῶπλα.' In Lysand. 2 Plutarch quotes Aristotle as τὰς μεγάλας φύσεις ἀποφαίνων μελαγχολικός, ὡς τὴν Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἡρακλέους. 'Quis unquam fando audivit Herculem, qui semper bibax et edax apud Aristophanem et in fine Euripidis Alcestidis e. g. exhibetur . . . fuisse melancholicum . . . quis credat Plutarchum principem Graecorum heroum, qui Athenis adeo ut deus colebatur, post Socratem et Platonem demum nominavisse?' He is confident that we should read Περικλέους. But the passage of Aristotle to which Plutarch refers (Probl. p. 953a 27) leaves no doubt that Ἡρακλέους is the right reading. For before naming τῶν ἰστέρον Εμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ ἕτεροι συχνοὶ τῶν γνωρίμων, Aristotle devotes several lines to the proof that the history of Herakles is an illustration of the rule that πάντες ὅσοι περιττοὶ γεγόνασιν ἄνδρες . . . φαίνονται μελαγχολικοὶ ὄντες.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A melancholy proof that van S. does not know what μελαγχολικός meant. Greek μελαγχολικός and Dutch *swaarmoedig*, *droefgeestig* are not the same.—B. L. G.

The first article, pp. 1-10, contains critical notes on Aristotle. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Metaphysics* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

The second article, pp. 11-20, contains critical notes on Plato. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Republic* and the *Symposium*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

The third article, pp. 21-30, contains critical notes on Aristotle. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Metaphysics* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

The fourth article, pp. 31-40, contains critical notes on Plato. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Republic* and the *Symposium*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

The fifth article, pp. 41-50, contains critical notes on Aristotle. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Metaphysics* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

The next article, pp. 51-60, contains critical notes on Aristotle. The author, S. A. Nabet, discusses the *Metaphysics* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. He points out several errors in the text and proposes corrections. The article is written in a clear and concise style, and is well organized.

that we cannot suppose that the fifty *πρυτάνεις* struggled with each other for the first bench, like Philocleon in *Vespae* 90, since all had the *προεδρία* alike; "sed dum quisque properabat capessere sedem, turba oriebatur intrantium *περὶ πρῶτον ξύλον*." The acc. is found in the same sense in 692: *γέροντ' ἀπολέσαι πολλῶν ἀνδρα περὶ κλεψύδραν*. He interprets 994-9, reading *προσλαβεῖν* for *προσβαλεῖν*, of the simple employments of a country life which Dicaeopolis hopes he will again enjoy when peace is secured; 'vitem seret, ficum, olivam; nihil potest esse simplicius. Sed docti interpretes non satis sibi docti videntur, nisi doctam attulerint interpretationem. Sedulo quaerunt quis sit horum verborum *duplex sensus*. *Nequitia*, inquiunt, *inest in allusione ad ὄρχεις*, idque ne obliviscamur, etiam bis inculcant, cum poeta *ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον* et *ἡμερίδος ὄρχον* appellaverit . . . ne oliva quidem innocenter seri poterit . . . *rursus in hoc versu obscœnitas latet*. Roma locuta est."

On the *Equites*, 230-4, he denies that the words justify the interpretation of the Schol. that *οὐκ εἶχεν αὐτοῦ πρῶσωπεῖον διὰ τὸ δεδοικέναι τοὺς σκευοποιοὺς καὶ μὴ θέλειν μήτε πλάττειν μήτε σχηματίζειν τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Κλέωνος*. It is merely an ironical jest of the poet. "Qui histrio Cleonem agebat . . . ipso vultu totoque corporis habitu quam exactissime potuit referebat notam personam demagogi. Cleonem uno impetu omnes dum statim agnoscebant, erumpebant in cachinnos et plausum dabant. Demosthenes autem lepidissime negat, larvam satis esse similem, quam in illa comica partium distortionem omnes videbant tam esse similem, ut ovum non ovo similis esse dicerent."

In *Nubes*, 50, not understanding *ἐρίων περιουσίας*, he proposes to write *σιφῶν*, *ἐριουργίας*, and quotes Columella to show that such *cellae* were apt to have a bad smell, "sed putidum est in tali re veterum testimoniis uti et cavendum est ne imitemur exemplum illius Hispani, qui docte et cum cura demonstravit, pueros apud Athenienses plorare solitos fuisse, quum vapularent." On 417, *οἶνον τ' ἀπέχει καὶ γυμνασίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνοήτων*, he does not approve the substitution of *ἀθηναγίας* for *γυμνασίων*, though the line is quoted by Diog. La., perhaps from the second recension, with that reading (see p. 117), because "non placere poterit, si quis reputaverit in reliqua fabula voracitatis non fieri mentionem; nec tamen Herwerdenum sequar, qui *συμποσίων* rescripsit, nam nusquam video Socratem hilare convivium aversatum fuisse." Since, however, we are told in 837 and Av. 1554 that Socrates eschewed the bath, and in 992 and 1045 ff. the *Δίκαιος λόγος* condemns the bath on the ground of its enervating tendency, he proposes that *βαλανείων* should be read in this line. But Kock made the same suggestion in his ed. of 1862. On 541-2: *οὐδὲ πρεσβύτης ὁ λέγων τὰπη τῇ βακτηρίᾳ τύπτει τὸν παρόντ' ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ σκώμματα*, we have a long discussion as to the point of the reference to Eupolis; and then the suggestion is made that we should read *ἄρρητ' ἢ* for *τὰπη τῇ* [where the *ἢ* is hard to dispose of] and *φατίζων* for *ἀφανίζων*: "id tantum incommode accidit quod . . . verbum *φατίζειν* nusquam in comoedia legitur." On 583: *βροντῇ δ' ἐρράγη δι' ἀστραπῆς, δι' Ἄρματος* is suggested, in allusion to the proverbial expression *δταν ἀστράπη δι' Ἄρματος*. In 712, among the other sufferings inflicted on Strepsiades by *οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἐκ τοῦ σκίμποδος ἐξέρποντες*, he mentions *καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκπίνουσιν*. Naber proposes *τὴν ψωλὴν*, a substitution which was made by Brunck in *Lysistr.* 963. But he has not observed that in 719 Strepsiades describes the same affliction by the words *φροῦδῃ ψυχῇ*, which, with the substitution of *ψωλῇ*, we can hardly suppose to

have been within the competence of his tormentors. In 1138, Strepsiades is indignant at the rigor of his stony-hearted creditors who will not recognize as *μέτρια καὶ δίκαια* his proposals, *ὦ δαιμόνιε, τὸ μὲν τι νοτὶ μὴ λάβῃς, τὸ δ' ἀναβαλοῦ μοι, τὸ δ' ἄφες*. Naber quotes the explanation of G. Hermann, "qui Kockio imposuit." "*Φιλόγελος* sit oportet qui ad tam frigidum iocum subridere possit. Emenda: τὸ μὲν τι νοτὶ μοι λαβέ. Verbum non addam." The creditors, however, appear to have understood the matter as Hermann did; for we are told: *οὐ φασὶν ποτε οὕτως ἀπολήψεσθ', ἀλλὰ λουδοροῦσάι με*.

On *Vesprae* 16, Naber suggests *ἰδοῦσιν ἄετ' ἀναπτύμενον ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν ὄραν μέγαν* for *μέγαν πάντε*, as well as two other alterations of the passage which seem less probable. On 98, *ἐν θύρῃ Δῆμον καλόν*, he shows that while there is abundant evidence that the Greeks inscribed the names of their favorites on walls and trees, there is none that they did so on doors; and accordingly he would write *φάτρῃ* for *θύρῃ*; and if any one objects that such a confirmed cit as Philocleon would never go outside the walls where he could see the trees so "abused," he endeavors to prove that there must have been trees in Athens itself in private grounds or public spaces. On 554, *κἀπειτ' εὐθὺς προσιόντι ἐμβάλλει μοι τὴν χεῖρ' ἀπαλὴν τῶν δημοσίων πεκλοφῶαν*, where *ἐμβάλλει* occurs between two plural verbs, he objects to the *ἐμβάλλοντον* of Hirschig, and the *ἐμβάλλει μοί τις* of Meineke, and proposes *προσιόν τις ἐμβάλλει τὴν χεῖρ' ἀπαλὴν τὴν κτέ*. Some sixteen passages of the *Pax*, also, are commented on in this article.

H. van Herwerden follows, pp. 386-99, with *Conjecturae Epigraphicae* on G. Kaibel's *Epigrammata Graeca*. Two short extracts may be made. "*Ὅσοι γὰρ ψυχὰ [σεμνῶς τ' ἀγαθῶς τ'] ἐβίωσαν*. Licet hoc poetarum genus nihil non sibi permittere videatur, non tamen indicta causa singuli damnandi sunt, ut arbitror. Nempe qui in hoc epigrammate reliqua probe scripsit, huic tribuere nolim cum editore vocabulum pessimae notae *ἀγαθῶς* pro *εὖ*, et potius suppleverim *ὅσοι γὰρ ψυχὰ [σεμνῶς θ' ἀγνῶς τ'] ἐβίωσαν*." "In Hadriani scriptoris epigrammate reperto apud Thespias vs. 1: *ὦ καὶ τοξότα Κενκρίδος λεγείης* Kaibelius suspicatur Musarum sacris Thespias translatis Veneri Musarum et speciem et nominationem aliquam accessisse. Quod credat qui poterit. Mihi non persuasum est imperatorem non dedisse *γλυκείης*."

The next article, pp. 400-13, is by Cobet, entitled *Herodotea*. He uses Stein's text, 1869-71. The apparatus furnished by this editor for the three chief MSS, the 10th century, B of the 11th, and R of the 14th, leaves nothing to be added; and no other authorities are needed: "caeteri codices omnes et quidscripturarum ex iis congestum est citra damnum abici possunt et vel in 1 coniici." It is even matter of regret that Stein has reported all the variations he has. "In codicibus antiquissimis (id est saeculo IX, X et XI) ubique τὸ παραγεγραμμένον ἰῶτα cernitur, in minus antiquis idem ubique additur. Hinc sarrago discrepantium lectionum nullius pretii et momenti habetur. In A B constanter ἰῶτα additur, in R eadem constantia semper additur. Sexcenties annotatur *χρήζω* A B, *χρήζω* R . . . et similia passim . . . et has ineptias: et omnino omnes scribarum errores, ubi de vera scriptura est dubitatio. Constat inter omnes verbi *ἐρχομαι* imperfectum in Ionia *ἦε, ἦλε, ἦσαν*, cum omnibus compositis. Nonne absurdum est igitur III 74 *ἴσαν* afferri ex libris: *ἦσαν, ἦσαν, ἦμεσαν, ἦμεσαν, ἴσαν, ἴσαν*, et *εἴσαν*? aut

VI 46 pro προσήιε scribi προσήει, προσήει, προσείη, et προσείηε?" Cobet then proceeds to discuss the merits of the three MSS and Stein's judgment on them. "A et B duo vetustissimi tam fideliter inter se conspirant etiam in minutioribus cum perexigua tantum discrepantia, ut constet inter omnes *duos hos libros pro uno et eodem haberi posse*: 'tanta sunt inter se similitudine ut fere unius instar sint, nec tamen tanta ut alter ex altero descriptus videatur' ut rectissime iudicat Stein. Miraberis autem in libris tam antiquis tam paucas bonas et veras scripturas reperiri." The number of corrupt passages in which these MSS present the true reading is, by Stein's admission, quite small. But their excellence, Stein says, consists in the fact "*quod uni ex omnibus interpolatorum temeritate fere vacui manserunt, quod quale sit infra apparebit.*" As to the merits of R, the opinion of the earlier critics, which Stein confesses himself to have shared, was that they were very high. Stein has convinced himself now, however, that this MS has been greatly overrated: 'quidquid unus R offert id omne est aut correctum aut erratum.' The merits of this corrector, however, are praised in such high terms by Stein that "de Valckenario aut Bentleio aut Porsono agi putes." Cobet then proceeds to show how such different opinions can have been formed about the same codex. "Derivatus est enim ex libro antiquo emendatissime scripto et longe longeque fidelior et certior teste quam sunt A et B. Passim ille liber ipsam Herodoti manum solus servavit corruptam apud reliquos omnes. Ex illo codice fluxerunt per complures hominum aetates apographa permulta alia ex aliis propagata, quorum ultima ad nostram aetatem perdurarunt. . . Hi omnes in mendis et erroribus et lacunis ferme inter se conspirant. Optimum omnium et antiquius caeteris est Romanum exemplum." Cobet then gives a long list of manifest errors in R where A and B have the true reading. "In antiquo libro unde R propagatus est, versus erant litterarum 15-18. Deprehendi id potest III 54, ubi in R sic scriptum est: οἱ δὲ ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνοντες Λακεδαιμονίων pro: οἱ δὲ ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνον. εἰ μὲν νῦν οἱ παρεόντες Λακεδαιμονίων. Erat autem in vetusto codice. ΟΙΔΕΕΠΙ | ΣΠΙΟΜΕΝΟΙΕΚΤΕΙΝΟΝ | εἰ μὲν νῦν οἱ παρόντ | ΤΕΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, et scriba socors omisso versu tertio inepte coniunxit ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνοντες Λακεδαιμονίων." To show why, notwithstanding these many errors, he still regards R as "unum omnium testem optimum," he says "utar in eam rem comparatione: duo antiqui libri sunt veluti duo senes, homines frugi et graves sed rustici et ingenii obtusioris. Contra Romanus adolescentis instar est, qui nobili loco natus et divitiis affluens liberius vivit vino et amoris dans ludum, sed idem lepidus, urbanus, elegans, venustus homo. Is si forte temulentus est οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς loquitur, sed ubi se collegit et ad se rediit faceti ingenii est et iucundissimi sermonis. Quem modo audivimus meras nugas deblaterantem, idem permagnum numerum optimarum lectionum solus servat, quae tantam habent ἐνάργειαν, ut Stein ipse longe maximam earum partem ex solo R in textum receperit." Cobet then gives some instances of this, only one of which can be here quoted. In VI 128, Clisthenes tested the suitors for the hand of Agariste in various ways: "καὶ τό γε μέγιστον ἐν τῇ συνεστίῃ διεπειρᾶτο. Audi nunc Steinium: 'συνεστήναι A: συνιστήναι Bredovius, τῇσι λοτήσεσι L. Dindorf, ipse tentabam τῇ συνιστήσῃ ἐπεπᾶτο.' Sardi venales, alius alio nequior. Quid est igitur ab Herodoto scriptum? Id quod unice verum et in Vaticano codice solo servatum est: ἐν τῇ συνεστοί (συνεστοῖ). Dialectus Ionica et vetus Attica habebat nomen ἐστώ id est οὐσία, et ἀπεστώ pro ἀποουσία, et εὐεστώ pro

*εὐδαιμονία* et *κακιστώ* pro *δυστυχία* et *ἀειεστώ* pro *αἰώνιος οἰσία*, et sic *συνεστῶ* pro *συνουσία*, id est *συναναστροφῇ*, de hominum inter se usu et consuetudine . . . Ecquis ad hanc lucem serio credere poterit *συνεστοῖ*, quod nusquam alibi locorum comparet, ex Graeculi correctione esse natam?" In R the fifth book is wanting, the text of which is, however, the most correct of all. Why is this? "Non omnes habebant olim Herodotum *τοῦτον* (ut nec Romani Livium) sed circumferebantur codices, quibus aut singuli libri aut pars aliqua librorum contineretur. Sic factum est ut libri nostri non ex uno eodemque fonte omnes manaverint, sed alii ex aliis interdum melioribus interdum deterioribus sint descripti." The writer, therefore, of the original of R was probably unable to obtain a copy of Book V. It is notable also that in A and B, at the end of Books V, VIII, IX, there is a stichometric number. "In caeteris libris nulla est *στιχομετρία*. Cur? Quia libri V et VIII et IX ex alio libro quam reliqui desumti sunt."

But little space is left for the two remaining articles. The first of them, pp. 414-23, is by L. C. Volgraff, entitled *Λαμπρὰ Σάτυρα*. We have here conjectural emendations of certain passages. *E. g.* in Thuc. I 5, 2, we read that piracy was no discredit, even to some of the historian's contemporaries, *οἷς κόσμος καλῶς τοῦτο δρᾶν*. We are told to expunge *καλῶς*, as a marginal comment (cf. Cobet, N. L. p. 441), and the same remedy is to be applied in Isocr. IV 158. In Thuc. I 10, 2, *τῆς δυνάμεως* is to be omitted; in I 134, 4, *οἵπερ τοὺς κακούργους* is to be erased; and in III 82, 1, for *ἐτοίμων* we are to read *ἐτόλμων*. The last two have much probability. There is offered, besides an emendation of a fragment of Diphilus, one of Lucian's *ὄνειρος ἢ Ἀλεκτριῶν*, and several of Procopius *de bello Persico*.

The last article, pp. 424-48, is by Cobet on Julian. He commends in the highest terms the recent edition of Hertlein, whose only fault is that "misellos libros nullius momenti aut pretii, . . . ut testes mendaces et corruptos, tamen producendos et audiendos esse censuit." He should have regarded the *Vossianus* alone, which is at Cobet's side as he writes, and "tam anxia cura ab Editore excussus est ut nihil supersit agendum." In these notes there is not much of general interest. It is shown that Julian "immodicis laudibus extollit in coelum Constantium principem, minimi pretii hominem," speaking of his wife as *γαμετὴ βασιλέως ἀνδρείου σώφρονος συνετοῦ δικαίου χρηστοῦ καὶ πράου καὶ μεγαλοψύχου*, "sed veros animi sensus aperit; ἄρ' οὐκ ὀνειδίζει μοι καὶ καταγελά τῆς μωρίας, ὅτι τὸν φονέα πατρός, ἀδελφῶν, ἀνεψιῶν, ἀπάσης ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν ἐστίας καὶ συγγενείας τὸν δῆμιον εἰς τοῦτο ἐθεράπευσα;" Several passages are referred to the originals from which they are copied. "Quidquid erat in Graecia hominum elegantiorum ut Homeri carmina sic Demosthenis orationes tenebant memoriter et statim agnoscebant si quis iis lepide et scite uteretur." We have, of course, many illustrations of the barbarisms which are to be left "Juliano cum sequioribus saepius sic peccanti;" as *ἀμαρτήσω* for *ἀμαρτήσομαι*, *παρά* for *ὑπό*, *μή* for *οὐ*, etc.; and as to Julian's style in general, "quam sit Julianus loquax et verbosus *δὲς καὶ τρεῖς ταῦτ' εἰσάγων* operae pretium est semel diligenter animadvertere." After giving examples of his garrulity ("quae est, ut libere dicam, *μακρὰ καὶ διωλύγιος φλυαρία*"), and a long list of synonyms "nulla elegantia cumulatorum," he concludes: "possem multo plura de genere hoc congerere, sed, ut Juliani verbis utar: *τί πέρας ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τῶν λόγων εἰ ταῦτα μήπω σε πείθει;*"

C. D. MORRIS.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

I find that my criticisms on Max Müller's views on *Septentrio* have been partially anticipated by Mr. Ch. Ploix in the *Mémoires de la Société de la Linguistique*, I, pp. 377 sq., a paper which I have only just seen.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Trinity College, Cambridge, *April* 11, 1883.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Braune (W.) Gothic Grammar with selections for reading and a Glossary. Translated from the second German edition by G. H. Balg. N. Y. *B. Westermann & Co.* 8vo. 90c.

Condit (I. M.) English and Chinese dictionary. *Am. Tract Soc.* 12mo. 75c.

Liddell and Scott. A Greek-English lexicon. 7th ed., rev. and augmented throughout, with the co-operation of Prof. Drisler. *Harper.* 4to shp. \$10.

Pliny. Selections from the letters of Pliny; ed. by G. O. Holbrooke. *Allyn.* 16mo. \$1.

Virgil. The greater poems of Virgil. V. 1 contains the pastoral poems and six books of the *Æneid*; ed. by J. B. Greenough. *Ginn.* il. 12mo. \$1.55, without vocabulary \$1.25.

### BRITISH.

Aelfric's Lives of the Saints. Edited, from MS Julius E. VII Cotton., by W. W. Skeat. 8vo, sd., 256 pp. 10s.

Babrius. Ed. by W. Gunion Rutherford. 8vo, 292 pp. *Macmillan.* 12s. 6d.

Demosthenes against Androtion and against Timocrates. Ed. by William Wayte. Post 8vo, 320 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 7s. 6d.

Euripides. Medea. Ed. by A. W. Verrall. 12mo, 160 pp. *Macmillan.* 3s. 6d.

Guest (Edwin). Origines Celticæ. 2 vols., 8vo, 960 pp. *Macmillan.* 32s.

Homer's Iliad. Done into English Prose by A. Lang, W. Leaf, and E. Myers. Post 8vo, 490 pp. *Macmillan.* 12s. 6d.

Homer's Odyssey. Books 21-4. Edited by S. G. Hamilton. 12mo, 136 pp. *Macmillan.* 3s. 6d.

Horace. Liber 4. Ed. by T. E. Page. 12mo, 102 pp. *Macmillan.* 2s.

Lenormant (F.) The Beginnings of History. From the second French ed. With an Introduction by Francis Brown. Post 8vo, 600 pp. *Low.* 12s.

Müller (F. Max). Sacred Books of the East. Vol. 14, Sacred Laws of the Aryas. Translated by Georg Buhler. Part 2, Vasishta and Baudhayana. 8vo, 390 pp. *Frowde.* 10s. 6d.

— Sacred Books of the East. Vol. 18, Pahlavi Texts. Translated by E. W. West. Part 2, The Dadistan I Dinik and the Epistles of Manuskihar. 8vo, 506 pp. *Frowde.* 12s. 6d.





Landberg (Carlo). Proverbes et dictons du peuple arabe. Volume I, Province de Syrie, section de Saydâ. Gr. in-8. Leyde. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Menant (J.) Empreintes de cachets assyro-chaldéens, relevés au Musée britannique sur des contrats d'intérêt privé. In-8, 106 fig. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr. 50.

Naville (Ed.) Inscription historique de Pinodjem III, grand prêtre d'Ammon à Thèbes, traduite et commentée par Edouard Naville. In-4 avec planche. *Maisonneuve*. 8 fr.

Notes grammaticales sur la langue de Lifu (Loyaltys), par le P. A. C. prêtre mariste. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 4 fr.

Rosny (Léon de). Essai sur le déchiffrement de l'écriture hiératique de l'Amérique centrale. 4 livraison (dernière). In-folio. *Maisonneuve*. 25 fr.

## GERMAN.

Aischylos. Agamemnon, erklärt v. F. W. Schneidewin. 2 Aufl., besorgt v. Otto Hense. gr. 8, xvi, 218 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 2.25.

Anthologia lyrica. Curavit Thdr. Bergk. Ed. III, ex poetarum lyricorum graecorum ed. IV expressa. 8, vi, 383 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 3.

Aristoxenus v. Tarent, Melik u. Rhythmik. d. classischen Hellenenthums. Übers. u. erläutert durch Dr. R. Westphal. gr. 8, lxxiv, 508 S. Leipzig, *Abel*. n. —30. geb. n. 33.

Bartholomae (Chr.) Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekte. gr. 8, vii, 272 S. Leipzig, *Breitkopf & Härtel*. n. 6.

Benndorf (Otto). Vorläufiger Bericht üb. zwei österreichische archäologische Expeditionen nach Kleinasien. gr. 8, 101 S. m. 5 Taf. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 3.

Bergmann (Fr.) Hohelied Salomo's u. der Prediger Salomo, aus dem urtext übers. u. erklärt. 8, viii, 111 S. Strassburg, *Treuttel & Würtz*. n. 3.50.

Braun (W.) Der Thyestes d. Euripides. gr. 8, 21 S. Wesel, 1882, *Kühler in Comm.* n. —50.

Broschmann (M.) De γάρ particulae usu Herodoteo. Diss. gr. 8, vii, 89 S. Leipzig, 1882, *Fock*. baar n.n. 2.50.

Buschmann (H.) Bilder aus dem alten Rom. gr. 8, iv, 283 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 3.60.

Brugsch (H.) Thesaurus inscriptionum aegyptiacarum. 1 Abth. A. u. d. T. Astronomische u. astrolog. Inschriften altägypt. Denkmäler. hoch 4, vii, 194 S. Leipzig, *Hinrich's Verl.* baar n.n. 50.

Canello (U. A.) La vita e le opere del trovatore Arnaldo Daniello. gr. 8, vi, 282 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 9.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Vol. XIII, partes I, II. gr. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. n. 9. Inhalt: I. Sophoniae in libros Aristotelis de anima paraphrasis. Ed. Mich. Hayduck. viii, 175 S. II. Anonymi in Aristotelis categorias paraphrasis. Ed. Mich. Hayduck. iv, 86 S.

Cruel (R.) Die Sprachen u. Völker Europas vor der arischen Einwanderung. Streifzüge auf turan. Sprachgebiete. gr. 8, vii, 174 S. Detmold, *Meyer in Comm.* baar n.n. 2.50.

Culmann (F. W.) Etymologische Aufsätze u. Grundsätze. VI. gr. 8. Strassburg, *Schmidt*. n. 1.20. (I–VI, n. 9.90.) Inhalt: Umschau auf dem Gebiete der historischen Zeitformen u. ihrer Augmente. Zweiter Beitrag zur Aufklärg. grammat. Geheimnisse. 48 S.



Kramm (Frz.) Üb. Konrads v. Heimesfurt Sprache [Laut- u. Formenlehre] u. Verskunst. gr. 8, 80 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. n. 1.80.

Kuhfeldt (O.) De Capitoliis imperii Romani. gr. 8, 83 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 2.

Kurschat (Frdr.) Littauisch-deutsches Wörterbuch. gr. 8, xii, 530 S. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhauses*. n. 12. (cplt. n. 39.)

Larfeld (Guil.) Sylloge inscriptionum boeoticarum. Praemittitur de dialecti boeoticae mutationibus dissertatio. gr. 8, xxxvi, 232 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. n. 10.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita libri. Scholarum in usum ed. Ant. Zingerle. Pars IV. Lib. XXVI–XXX. 8, xxiv, 233 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freitag*. n. 1.20.

Livi (Titi.) Ab urbe condita liber XXVIII. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. F. Friedersdorff. gr. 8, vii, 127 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.20.

Livius, ausgewählte Stücke aus der 3 Dekade. Mit Anmerkgn. v. W. Jordan. 3 Aufl. 8, xiv, 187 S. Stuttgart, *Neff*. n. 1.50.

Ludwig (Thdr.) De enuntiatorum interrogativorum apud Aristophanem usu. Diss. gr. 8, 69 S. Königsberg, 1882, *Beyer*. baar n. 1.20.

Marx (Frdr.) Studia Luciliana. Diss. gr. 8, 100 S. Bonn, 1882, *Behrendt*. n. 2.

Merguet (H.) Lexikon zu den Reden d. Cicero m. Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. 4 Bd. 1–4 Lfg. Lex.-8, S. 1–144. Jena, *Fischer*. (à) n. 2. (I–IV, 4, n. 137.)

Möller (Herm.) Das altenglische Volksepos in der ursprünglichen strophischen Form. 2 Tle. in 1 Bd. I. Abhandlungen; II. Texte. gr. 8, 160 u. 78 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. n. 5.

Münzel (Rob.) De Apollodori *περί θεῶν* libris. Diss. gr. 8, 39 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*. n. 1.

Neisser (Walther). Zur vedischen Verballehre. Diss. gr. 8, 35 S. Göttingen, 1882, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. —80.

Nissen (P.) Der Nominativ der verbundenen Personalpronomia in den ältesten französischen Sprachdenkmälern. Diss. gr. 8, 83 S. Greifswald, 1882. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. n. 1.60.

Ovidii Nasonis (P.) Carmina selecta. Scholarum in usum ed. Henr. Steph. Sedlmayer. 8, xviii, 139 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freitag*. n. —80.

— Werke. Deutsch im Versmasze der Urschrift. 4 Lfg. 8. Stuttgart, *Werther*. (à) n. —35. Inhalt: Metamorphosen, übers. u. erläutert v. Rhart. Suchier. 4 Lfg. 4 Aufl. S. 129–68.

Petri Hispani de lingua arabica libri duo, Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus repetiti. Lex.-8, viii, 440 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Sort. in Comm.* baar n.n. 20.

Plauti, F. Macci, comoediae. Rec., instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritscheli, sociis operae adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi II, fasc. 3. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 3.60. Inhalt: Mercator, rec. Frdr. Ritscheli. Ed. II, a Geo. Goetz recognita. xiii, 124 S.

Plutarch's ausgewählte Biographien. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Otto Siefert u. Frdr. Blass. 3 Bdchn. Themistokles u. Perikles. Von Dr. Frdr. Blass. 2 verb. Aufl. gr. 8, 136 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.50.

Roscher (Dr. W. H.) Nektar u. Ambrosia. gr. 8, viii, 116 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 3.60.



1 Thl. A. u. d. T. Oberländische Chrestomathie. gr. 8, viii, 275 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 6. (1 u. 2, n. 11.)

Vergils Aeneide, f. Schüler bearb. v. W. Gebhardi. 3 Tl. Der Aeneide 5 u. 6 Buch. gr. 8, xii, 183 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. n. 1.60. (1-3, n. 4.40.)

Wiedemann (Alfr.) Die ältesten Beziehungen zwischen Aegypten u. Griechenland. gr. 8, 22 S. Leipzig, *Barth*. —60.

Wüstenfeld (F.) Der Tod d. Husein ben 'Ali u. die Rache. Nach Handschriften übers. [Aus Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen.] gr. 4, ix, 213 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 9.

#### ITALIAN.

Avolio (C.) Introduzione allo studio del dialetto siciliano. Torino, 1882. 8vo, viii, 480 pp. 4m.

Campello della Spina (P.) Demagoghi e conservatori al tempo di Cesare, ed altri scritti. Firenze, 1883. 16mo, vi, 259 pp. 3m.

Canini (M. A.) Études étymologiques. Torino, 1882. 8vo, xvi, 291 pp. 10m.

Decea (C. A.) Saggio d'archeologia ed araldica biblica. Piacenza, 1882. 8vo, 112 pp. 2m. 40.

Fumi (F. G.) I. Note latine e neo-latine. Palermo, 1882. 8vo, xx, 150 pp. 6m.

#### SPANISH.

Mélida (J. R.) Sobre los vasos griegos, etruscos é italo-griegos del Museo arqueológico nacional. Madrid, 1882. 4to, 48 pp. 2m. 50.

---

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

Braune (W.) Gothic Grammar. Transl. from the second German edition by G. H. Balg. New York, *Westermann & Co.*, 1883.

Campbell (L.) The Theaetetus of Plato, with a revised text and English notes. 2d ed. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1883.

Demosthenes. The First Philippic. Ed. after Rehdantz by T. Gwatkin. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1883. 60 cts.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale der 18 Jahrhunderts in Neudrucken herausg. v. Bernhard Seuffert. No. 11, Der Messias, Erster, zweiter u. dritter Gesang. Von F. G. Klopstock. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 90 pf.

Englische Sprach- u. Litteraturdenkmale der 16, 17, u. 18 Jahrh. herausg. v. Karl Vollmöller. (1) Gorboduc, or Ferrex and Porrex. A tragedy by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, A. D. 1561. Ed. by L. Toulmin Smith. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 2m.

Euripides. Medea. Ed. by A. W. Verrall. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1882. 90 cts.

Fasnacht (G. E.) Synthetic French Grammar. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1882. \$1.

Goethe. Goetz von Berlichingen. Ed. by H. A. Bull. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1883. 55 cts.

Homer, The Iliad of. Done into English prose. By Andrew Lang, Walter Leaf and Ernest Myers. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1883.



# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. IV, 2.

WHOLE No. 14.

---

## I.—STICHOMETRY.

### *Introduction.*

The following investigations have been undertaken in the hope of obtaining some critical conclusions with regard to the extent of early documents, chiefly Biblical, from the apparently insignificant, yet highly important data furnished by certain numbers appended by ancient scribes to the books which they copied. It is only lately that I have come to regard, with any other feeling than complacent pity, the labors of those Masoretic editors of the Hebrew Bible who so carefully inform us as to the number of verses and the points of bisection of the separate books; the natural impulse of one's mind being towards the conclusion that such work might perhaps be agreeable at some period of involuntary incarceration accompanied by a most plentiful lack of books. The Masoretes themselves, however, seem to have been sensible of the importance as well as of the arduous nature of the work of book-measuring, since they preface their annotations with the word *קוץ*, which is generally understood to be an encouragement (*fortis esto*) either to themselves or their readers. How much more strongly would they have expressed themselves if their task had been, like ours, the inverse problem of restoring the ancient books from their accredited measurements! Doubtless their sympathy would have flowed (after the approved Rabbinic fashion, which I remember to have noted somewhere), in votive offerings of midnight oil for the labors of the devoted calculator.





numeration presents itself, as, for instance, n. 1027 (ed. Oxon.) has the subscription

—  
ΚΑΡΝΕΙΣΚΟΥ ΦΙΛΙΣΤΑ Β. ΑΡΙΘ. XXXHHΔΔΔΠΙΙΙ,

which implies that a certain portion of the writings of Karniskus contains 3238 verses. What these verses represent in *prose* writings is a problem presently to be considered.

Other instances of the preservation of the more ancient Greek numeration may be seen in the MSS of Herodotus, Cod. Laurentianus LXX 3, and Cod. Angelicanus C 1, 6, and in several important MSS of Demosthenes.

*Stichometry earlier than the Alexandrian Library.*

It is sufficiently evident that the custom of measuring literary works by *στίχοι* is coeval with literature itself, and instances may be given which establish the continuance of such measurements, both for prose and verse, down to the twelfth century, if not later. It is possible, however, that these more modern subscriptions are to a great extent traditional measurements from an earlier time. Ritschl,<sup>1</sup> in his important researches on the subject of stichometry, came to the conclusion that Callimachus, of the Alexandrian Library, was the inventor of the stichometric method; the chief authority for such a statement is found in the following extracts from Athenaeus:

Τοῦ Χαιρεφῶντος καὶ σύγγραμμα ἀναγράφει Καλλίμαχος ἐν τῷ τῶν παντοδαπῶν πίνακι γράφων οὕτως· Δεῖπνα ὅσα ἔγραψαν· Χαιρεφῶν Κυρηβίωνι· εἰθ' ἐξῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπέθηκεν· Ἐπειδὴ μοι πολλάκις ἐπέστειλας· στίχων τοέ. Athen. VI, p. 244 A.

Ἀνέγραψε δὲ αὐτὸν (νόμον τινὰ συσσιτικὸν) Καλλίμαχος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ πίνακι τῶν νόμων, καὶ ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ τήνδε παρέθετο· Ὅδε ὁ νόμος ἴσος ἐγράφη καὶ ὁμοιος· στίχων τριακοσίων εἴκοσι τριῶν. Athen. XIII, p. 585 B.

It will be evident, however, that these quotations really imply nothing more than a general statement that Callimachus entered books under certain catalogues, in which were found, with the name of the author and the title of the book, the first line of its contents, and the number of lines. And M. Graux<sup>2</sup> has pointed out that we have evidence anterior to Callimachus of the existence of prose works measured by their author in *ἔπη*, which is

<sup>1</sup> Opusc. Philolog. I, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Revue de Philologie, April, 1878, p. 97.



gate renders by in primo *versu* erit lapis sardius, etc. In a military sense the *στίχος* is used of either a rank or file of soldiers, but more properly belongs to the latter. Thus we find in Montfaucon, Bibl. Coislin., cod. 347, some fragments of a little work De Tacticis, and here *στίχος καὶ δεκανία καὶ λόχος τὸ αὐτό ἐστίν· βάθος ἐστὶ φάλαγγος τὸ μὲν τὸ μέτωπον ἅπαν καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ λοχαγοῦ ἐπὶ οὐραγὸν στίχος καὶ βάθος λέγεται*, and the definition of *λόχος* contains the following interesting statement, showing that the fondness for particular numerical arrangements was gratified on every opportunity: *ἔνιοι μὲν τὸ σύστημα τὸ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ὀκτῶ οἱ δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν δώδεκα, οἱ δὲ τὸ ἐκ δεκαῆς ἀνδρῶν πλήθος δὲ καὶ τελειὸν φασὶ καὶ σύμμετρον*. We see that a preference is shown in arranging the men for the numbers 8, 10, 12, and 16.

Precisely similar statements are found in Ælian, Tactic. IV, from which we may take the following:

*Ὁ δὲ λόχος ἐστὶν ἀριθμὸς ἀνδρῶν ἀπὸ τινος ἡγουμένου καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτὸν ὀπισθεν ἐπομένων μέχρι τοῦ τελευταίου· τὸν δὲ ἀριθμὸν τοῦ λόχου οἱ μὲν ὀκτῶ ἀνδρῶν ἐποίησαν, οἱ δὲ δώδεκα, οἱ δὲ δεκαῆς· ἔστω δὲ νῦν ἐκκαίδεκα ἀνδρῶν ὁ λόχος· συμμέτρως γὰρ ἔχει πρὸς τε τὸ μῆκος τῆς φάλαγγος· ὁ λόχος δὲ ὅλος καλεῖται στίχος, ὀνομάζεται δὲ καὶ δεκανία, ὑπο δὲ τινῶν ἐνωμοτία.*

*Στίχος a measure of syllables rather than words.*

We shall then not be surprised if we find that the scribes, in arranging or in measuring their lines, show a preference for particular numbers; and any such plan of fixing the length of the line must evidently be by the enumeration, either of the letters, syllables, or words which the line contains. The last of these suppositions may be rejected almost at once; the continuous writing of early times pays little regard to words, which are broken up by the line-endings with the greatest freedom. On the other hand, the very greatest respect is paid to the division of syllables; it is true that this is somewhat obscured by the fact that the ancient division of syllables is different from the modern English method; but if we observe that the ancient syllable, in Greek manuscripts, ends with a vowel or weak letter, we can easily trace in most of the early MSS a complete system of syllable-section; and this respect paid to the syllable is a transcriptional phenomenon of great importance.<sup>1</sup>

In fact, in many cases where we should speak of words, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kühner, Grammar I 273, and Westcott and Hort, Introd. to N. T. 315.

# THE HISTORY OF THE ROMANS

... of the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...

... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...

... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...

## THE HISTORY OF THE ROMANS

... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...  
... the Romans ... in the year 1000 ...

*Στίχος identified with hexameter of 16 syllables.*

According to Galen then, 39 syllables of prose writing are equivalent to 2½ hexameters; 83 syllables represent 5 hexameters; the two quotations together, 122 syllables, do not amount to more than eight hexameters. From which it is obvious that the prose hexameter of Galen is 16 syllables; and we observe further that this line-unit is dignified with the alternative titles of *ἔπος ἐξάμετρον*, *ἔπος*, and *στίχος ἡρωϊκός*. The peculiarity in the use of these words seems to consist in the extension of the meaning of *ἔπος* which is implied in the use of an adjective, from its normal meaning of a heroic or hexameter line to the more general application which includes any written line whatever; while, on the other hand, the term *στίχος*, which normally represents any written line whatever, undergoes a contraction of meaning until we frequently find it used synonymously with hexameter, even to the exclusion of lines of other lengths. A curious instance of this may be seen in a tenth-century MS, written on Mount Athos, and described in Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.*, p. 597. Here we find *στίχος* used of hexameter verses, in distinction from iambics.

*περὶ ποιητῶν.*

*ὅσοι διὰ στίχων καὶ λάμβων ἔφρασαν·*

*Ὅμηρος στίχους, Ἀπολλώνιος στίχους, Θεόκριτος ὁμοίως,*

*Ἄρατος ὁμοίως, Νίκανδρος ὁμοίως, Μένανδρος λάμβους κτέ.*

So far, then, everything tends to the assumption that the *στίχος* is equivalent to the average hexameter, a conclusion which will be abundantly verified by an actual reference to texts and documents. It also seems that there is a preference shown for measuring the average hexameter by syllables, probably sixteen in number. The number of syllables in a hexameter is an instance of variation between fixed limits (cf. the definition quoted from Hephaestion); but the number sixteen invites especial attention, as being that suggested by the first line of Homer, and also on account of its symmetrical or square character, which, as we have already seen, gave it a preference in the determination of the conventional number of ranks in a phalanx of soldiers, and which was always an important feature in the eyes of those who saw special Pythagorean virtues in numbers.

*Alternative of a letter-line.*

On the other hand we must enquire whether there is any ground for asserting the existence of a letter-line in preference to a syllable-line; for it may be assumed, I think, with safety that the art of transcription undergoes a double development: first, it changes from letter-by-letter writing to a writing syllable-by-syllable, and from this, for greater ease in reading, to a transcription word-by-word; so that the lines for successive periods of time would end, in the first case with the geometrical limit of the line, in the second and third cases with the most convenient syllable or word. And this change is evidently in the direction from a very regular line, such as those found in many early inscriptions, to one not quite so regular, such as occurs in early vellum MSS, and so to the somewhat irregular later writing. We should expect then to find some traces of the measurement of the actual number of letters in a line. The following are the only instances with which I am acquainted.

On the back of an astronomical work of Eudoxus,<sup>1</sup> dating from the second century before Christ, are twelve verses forming the acrostic ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥ ΤΕΧΝΗ; these are arranged so that each of the letters is a day, each of the lines represents a month,

poem a year of 365 days: according to the verse  
 ἔστι, γράμμα δ' ἡμέρα.<sup>2</sup> Another instance is given by  
 Hippus Alexandrinus (II 17, 4; II 23) in which the

Ἀρτίμυθος κλεῖτε κράτος ἔξοχον ἐνεία κοῦραι

38 letters (εἰπεῖ οὖν γράμματά ἐστιν λή τοῦ στίχου).

These instances bears very exactly upon our enquiry: however, traces of a method of measurement which was common in early times, when the letter, rather than the syllable, was the basis of metre and prose alike. It is evident principle that a MS written on the basis of the letter will be reckoned by the number of its letters, and a MS written on the basis of the syllable will be numbered by its

<sup>1</sup> Gr. Palaeographie, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Birt, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup> Birt, Buchwesen, p. 161.

*Actual Calculation of the Length of Lines for Various Authors.*

We shall now confirm these results by the examination of actual data supplied by MSS and authors, following closely the results of M. Graux, with such changes as may be necessary in the arrangement of the matter, and some additions and corrections. Where the results deduced for the value of the *στιχος* are given in letters, we have only to remember that the average hexameter, taken by M. Graux from 50 lines of the Iliad opened at random, is 37.7 letters; and where the result is given in syllables, the average is 15.6 syllables, as deduced by Diels<sup>1</sup> from the first fifty lines of the Iliad. In every case we must divide the estimated letters or syllables of a book by the number of traditional lines. We begin with Herodotus; stichometric notes are found in Laurentianus LXX 3, and Angelicanus C 1, 6, to books IV, V, VIII, IX.

M. Graux gives as follows:

		<i>Lines.</i>	<i>Letters to line.</i>
Book IV	XXXHHΠIII	3253	37.6
V	XXHH	2200	37.5
VIII	XXHHHΔΔII	2322	37.6
IX	XXHHΠI	2206	37

Diels measures the syllables, giving:

	<i>Total lines.</i>	<i>Total syllables.</i>	<i>Syllables to line.</i>
Book IV	3253	48940	15.08
IX	2206	32640	14.8

For Thucydides we have the following from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Judic. de Thucyd. c. 10):

Book I, c. 1-87	δισχίλιοι	2000	35
I, c. 1-23	πεντακόσιοι	500	35

Diels estimates the syllables for the second passage to be 7740 and deduces a normal line of 15.5 syllables. There are several other stichometric notes in Dionysius to other passages of Thucydides, for which M. Graux did not quote the results, because they seemed to diverge from the preceding. The difficulty in such cases is that the numbers are approximate and the passages not clearly defined. They will be found, according to Birt (p. 198), to give results agreeing closely with a line of 35 letters.

<sup>1</sup> Diels, *Hermes*, XVII Bd., 3 Heft.



In Isocrates we have a single subscription from Codex Urbinas, together with some other marks to be discussed later on. This gives us :

		<i>Lines.</i>	<i>Letter line.</i>
Busiris	HHH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ	390	37.4

Diels gives 6070 syllables and deduces 15.5 syllables to the line, which is sufficiently near, though his estimate is in reality in excess by 30 syllables. Fuhr repeated M. Graux's calculation and made 37.66 letters to the *στίχος*.<sup>1</sup> With the same datum corrected to 395, as suggested by Fuhr, we have a line of 15.2 syllables.

For Demosthenes we have a valuable collection of data from Graux and W. Christ,<sup>2</sup> which may be exhibited in one table, with the corresponding MS authority and the deduced value of the *στίχος*. The notation of the MSS is based on that of Vömel, and no account is taken of documents inserted in the text. Obvious errors are corrected.

	<i>MSS.</i>	<i>Data.</i>	<i>Corrected lines.</i>	<i>Letter line.</i>
1 Olynth.	Σ BF.	HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΠ	265	34.8
2 Olynth.	Σ } BFA <sub>3</sub> }	HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔΠ } HHΔΔΔΔΠ }	295	35.3
3 Olynth.	Σ BF.	HHHΔΔΠ	325	36.6
1 Philipp.	Σ BF.	HHHH <sup>ρ</sup> Δ	455	36.4
Peace	Σ BF.	HHΠΙ	206	35.7
2 Philipp.	Σ BF.	HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ	290	35
Halonnesus	Σ BF.	HHHΔΔΔΔΠ	345	36.7
Chersonesus	Σ BFA <sub>3</sub> .	<sup>ρ</sup> <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ	590	37.3
3 Philipp.	Σ } A <sub>3</sub> } BF. }	<sup>ρ</sup> <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ } <sup>ρ</sup> <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ }	580	36.3
4 Philipp.	Σ } B. } A <sub>3</sub> }	<sup>ρ</sup> HΔΔΔHH } <sup>ρ</sup> HΔΔΔH } <sup>ρ</sup> HΔΔΔIIII }	634	35.8
Letter of Philip	Σ BFA <sub>3</sub> .	H <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔΠΙ	196	35.1
Περὶ συντάξεως	Σ BF.	HHHΔΔΔ	330	35.8
Περὶ τῶν Συμμορίων	Σ BF.	HHH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔ	390	34
Liberty of Rhodians,	Σ } BF. } Corr. }	HHHΔΔΔΔΠII } HHHΔΔΔΔIIII }	334	34.5
Megalopolitans	Σ } BF. } Corr. }	HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔIIIIH } HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΔΔΠIII }	288	33.9
Treaty with Alexander,	Vat. } Corr. }	HHHΔΔΔHII } HH <sup>ρ</sup> ΔΔΠII }	277	34.6

<sup>1</sup> Rhein. Mus. Bd. 37, Heft 3, p. 468.    <sup>2</sup> Die Atticusaussage des Demosthenes.

STICHOMETRY.

	<i>MSS.</i>	<i>Data.</i>	<i>Corrected lines.</i>
Crown	BF. } Σ	XXΠHHΠΔΗΠΠ } XXΠHHΠΔΠΠΠ }	2768
De fals. leg.	Σ BF.	XXXHHΠΔΔΔ	3280
Leptines	Σ BF.	XΠHΠΠΠ	1608
Midias	Σ BF. } Corr. }	XXΠΠ } XXHI }	2101
Androtion	Σ	ΠHHΠΔΔΔ	780
Aphobos I	Σ BF. } Corr. }	ΠHΠΔΔΔ } ΠHΠΔΔ }	670
Aphobos II	Σ	HHΔΔΔΔ	240
Adv. Onet.	Σ BF.	HΔΔΔΔ	140
Lacritos	Σ BF.	HHHHΔΔΔ	430
Nausimachos	Σ F.	HHΠΔΔ	270
Boeotos I	Σ	HHHΠΔΔΔ	380
Boeotos II	Σ	ΠΠΔΔ	570
Macartatos	Σ	ΠHΠΔΔ	670
Leochares	Σ	ΠHΔΔΔΔ	640
Stephanos I	Σ	ΠHHΠΔΔΔΔΠΠ	793
Corona Trierarch	Σ } Corr. }	HHΠH } HHΠΠ }	252
Callippos	Σ	HHHΔΔΠΠ	323
Nicostratos	Σ } Corr. }	HHΠΠ } HHHΠΠ }	306
Conon	Σ	HHHHΠΔ	460
Eubulides	Σ } Corr. }	ΠΠΔΔΔΔΔ } ΠHΠΔΔΔΔΔ }	690
Neaera	Σ } Corr. }	XHHHΠΠ } XHHΠΠ }	1251
Epitaph.	Σ } Corr. }	HHHHΠΠΠΠ } HHHΠΠΠΠ }	357
Eroticos	Σ } Corr. }	ΠΠΔΔΔ } ΠΠΔΔ }	560
Prooemia	Σ	XHHHΠΔΔ	1370
Epistle I	Σ } Corr. }	NΔΔΔΔΠ } HΔΔΔΔΠ }	135
Epistle II	Σ	HHΔΠΠΠ	217
Epistle III	Σ } Corr. }	ΠHHHΠΔΔΔ } HHHΠΔΔΔ }	370
Epistle IV	Σ	HI	101
Epistle V	Σ	ΔΔΔΔ	40

The majority of the corrections in the previous table (due to Blass, Sauppe, and Graux) are sufficiently obvious. The results exhibit a remarkable constancy, though they are slightly in defect of the full average hexameter.

On the application of these data to the study of the genealogy of the MSS of Demosthenes, we must refer to W. Christ's valuable paper, previously alluded to.

Reserving the question of Biblical and Euthalian stichometry for later consideration, we have the following further references from M. Graux.

For Eusebius: *Praeparatio Evangelica*; from the MS Paris 451:

		<i>Lines.</i>	<i>Letter line.</i>
Lib. I	$\overline{A\Phi H\Gamma} = \overline{A\Phi N\Gamma}$	= 1553	37.2
Lib. II.	$\overline{A\Upsilon\Pi\Gamma}$	= 1483	37.2
Lib. III.	$\overline{A\Omega N H}$	= 1858	36.1

For Gregory of Nazianzus; from the MS Laur. VII 8:

Homily I	$\overline{P H}$	36	Homily XXIII	$\overline{T M B}$	35.4
II	$\overline{A\Omega\varphi\zeta}$	35.4	XXIV	$\overline{\Upsilon\varphi E}$	36.2
III	$\overline{P M B}$	37	XXV	$\overline{\Phi\Xi\Theta}$	36
IV	$\overline{B\Upsilon N H}$	36.6	XXVI	$\overline{\Phi K\Gamma}$	36.4
V	$\overline{A M B}$	36.7	XXVII	$\overline{C I} = \overline{C O}$	36.7
VI	$\overline{X K E}$	36	XXVIII	$\overline{\Phi N\Theta} = \overline{\varphi N\Theta}$	36
VII	$\overline{\Psi I H}$	35	XXIX	$\overline{\Phi\varphi}$	37
VIII	$\overline{\Phi\Xi\Theta}$	35.9	XXX	$\overline{\Phi} = \overline{X}$	36.5
IX	$\overline{P M\Theta}$	37.4	XXXI	$\overline{\Psi O E}$	36.5
X	$\overline{P}$	35.9	XXXII	$\overline{\Omega I A}$	36.9
XI	$\overline{C\Theta}$	36	XXXIII	$\overline{\Upsilon M}$	36.6
XII	$\overline{P N}$	37.7	XXXIV	$\overline{\varphi\Theta} = \overline{C\varphi\Theta}$	36
XIV	$\overline{A I Z} = \overline{A P Z}$	36.2	XXXVI	$\overline{T \Lambda \Gamma}$	35.5
XV	$\overline{\Upsilon \Lambda}$	36.8	XXXVIII	$\overline{\Upsilon N E}$	36.6
XVI	$\overline{X K \zeta}$	35.3	XXXIX	$\overline{\Phi N} = \overline{\Phi H}$	36.6
XVII	$\overline{T \Lambda E}$	36.8	XL	$\overline{A \Upsilon I \Theta}$	36
XVIII	$\overline{A C \Lambda H}$	35.8	XLI	$\overline{\Upsilon \Pi A}$	37.2
XIX	$\overline{\Upsilon I Z}$	36.5	XLII	$\overline{\Psi \Lambda B}$	36
XX	$\overline{T A}$	36.6	XLIII	$\overline{B \Upsilon}$	35
XXI	$\overline{A P \Xi A} = \overline{\varphi \Xi A}$	35.6	XLIV	$\overline{C \varphi E}$	35.6
XXII	$\overline{\Upsilon \Lambda H}$	36.8	XLV	$\overline{\Omega \Pi \Gamma}$	35.9

And for the letters of Gregory from the same source :

Ep. CI	TM	36
Ep. CII	P = PΞ	36.9

It must be sufficiently patent from the foregoing researches of M. Graux that every speculation as to the equality between the *στίχος* and the average hexameter is abundantly confirmed. The only thing that does not appear from the results is whether the lines are measured by their letters or their syllables ; but this has been already discussed, and we have arrived at a high probability in favor of syllabic measurements, at least in the case of later authors.

*Alternative στίχος of twelve syllables.*

The next question that arises is whether there are traces of any other normal lines ; and in the first place, are there any instances of lines measured by iambic trimeters, or lines whose normal extent is 12 syllables? Now if we measure this line by letters, we at once find from 25 lines of the *Medea* of Euripides 29.96 letters ; and this number 29.96 is extremely suggestive when we examine the following passage from Josephus, at the close of the *Jewish Antiquities* : ἐπὶ οὗτοις τε καταπαύσω τὴν ἀρχαιολογίαν, βίβλοις μὲν εἴκοσι περιελημμένην, ἐξ δὲ μυριάσι στίχων.

If we take the assertion of Josephus literally, remarks M. Graux, we should find for the value of the *στίχος* the inadmissible quantity 28 or 29 letters. The statement is then explained to be a rough expansion of the assertion that each of the 20 books of the *Antiquities* contained 2000 or 3000 *στίχοι*. And Birt (*Buchwesen*, p. 204) suggests the alternative reading εἰ for εἴξ by which the Josephus line will be 34.2 letters. Obviously the lines are really iambic lines : and this is confirmed in several ways by other considerations which I have adduced elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> It will also be more apparent as we proceed with our subject.

The importance of the result is mainly this, that it establishes the habit of writing iambic lines, at least so far as regards the first century and the locality of Syria, a conclusion which may affect our views as to the character of the originals of the New Testament.

<sup>1</sup>Amer. Journ. Phil. 12, Suppl.

*Alternative of a longer line.*

Diels<sup>1</sup> believes that he has also found traces of a line even longer than the hexameter. He bases this belief on quotations which Galen makes from Hippocrates. From these we have:<sup>2</sup>

<i>Hippocrates (ed. Kühn).</i>	<i>Στίχοι.</i>	<i>Syllables.</i>	<i>Syllables to line.</i>	<i>Letters to line.</i>
I. 348—360, 18	240	4360	18	40.8
I. 348—371, + 616—625, 9	less than 600	11420	19	42.7
I. 624, 17—625, 9	about 10	212	21.2	49

Moreover, in another place, Galen (V 716, Kühn) reckons 86 syllables of Plato, Tim. p. 70 D, as 4 στίχοι.

The difficulty of admitting these results is considerable ; for we have already shown that Galen employs a sixteen-syllabled line for measuring στίχοι, and it is difficult to see how he should have varied his standard for another so nearly coincident with it as 18 syllables would be. Moreover, Diels has shown, with high probability, by very appropriate quotations, that not only did Galen use a line of 16 syllables as his unit, but that the early copies of his works were written in an exemplar of that very length. This he establishes by the following quotations and measurements:

Oribasius III 662, 3 (ed. Daremberg et Bussemaker) γίνεται δέ ποτε κτέ. From Galen, Meth. Med. XIV (X 1009, 4 sqq. Kühn), on which the Scholiast remarks (p. 689, 12) ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδ̄ τῆς θεραπευτικῆς ὡς πρὸ σν̄ στίχους (l. στίχων) τοῦ τέλους, κεφ. περὶ ἐρπητος. Three similar quotations are given from the same source,<sup>3</sup> and finally we have:

<i>Galen (ed. Kühn).</i>	<i>Στίχοι.</i>	<i>Normal Syllables.</i>	<i>Letters.</i>
X. 1007, 4—1021, 19	ca. 250	16.6	39.6
X. 445, 7—455, 12	ca. 200	15.9	41.2
X. 448, 4—455, 12	ca. 140	16.5	42.9
VII. 705, 1—717, 1	ca. 200	16	41

Galen, therefore, measures and perhaps even writes 16-syllabled lines ; and the only conclusion we can come to is that his copy of Hippocrates must have been slightly in excess of the ordinary pattern, rather than that it was written on a new pattern.

<sup>1</sup> Hermes, Bd. XVII, Heft 3.

<sup>2</sup> Galen, ed. Kühn, XV 9, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Oribasius, IV 179, 4 ; IV 181, 2 ; III 598, 11.

*Subdivision of lines in MSS.*

The existence of the normal hexameter and iambic lines is, however, so little obvious from surviving MSS themselves, that an objection arises against the previous investigations on the ground of want of actual paleographic evidence. Perhaps the deficiency on this point is due to two causes. First of all, the cataloguing of an exactly written library edition, such as would be found in the library at Alexandria, rendered the preservation of the stichometric form unnecessary and prepared the way for the breaking up of that form; and in the next place, the breadth of the columns of the papyrus-rolls did not generally admit that the lines should be written in full, and they were consequently subdivided into two, three, or more narrow lines. Conspicuous instances are furnished by the celebrated Vatican and Sinaitic codices of the Bible; of which the lines represent respectively a somewhat curtate half-hexameter and a similarly divided iambic trimeter. This I have shown to be the case in the two MSS in question by the actual examination of the text for the accidental hexameter in James I 17 and for a quoted iambic verse in 1 Cor. XV 34.<sup>1</sup> The supposition is confirmed by Baehrens,<sup>2</sup> in some good remarks on the Ancient Book-Form of Roman poets. And Baehrens points out that these subdivided lines may actually be seen in a papyrus roll represented on a Pompeian painting, where four lines are found divided into sixteen. This, however, may be nothing more than artistic license. In Montfaucon, Bibl. Coislin., for example, the Gospel of John is pictorially represented as being written by its author in lines of about a syllable each. The most likely place to find these subdivided lines is in epistles, which seem to have been written on shorter models.

*Partial Stichometry.*

A further development of the simple stichometric subscription is found in those MSS which inform us, by means of marginal notes from point to point, as to the number of *στίχοι* contained in

<sup>1</sup> American Journal of Philology, 12, Suppl. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie; Elftes Heft, 1882, p. 785: "aber dafür gab es nur eine möglichkeit, nemlich indem man die seiten schmaler machte; und dies führte wiederum notwendig dazu dass man grössere verse (hexameter u.s.w.) auf zwei oder mehr zeilen vertheilte."



may very well be the close of the sixth page of the exemplar copied, each page being 14 hexameters.

The mark  $\times$  also occurs, three times, once with the previous mark, once at the 345th *στίχος*, and once at the 368th. These are probably the marks of the *διορθωτής* or MS corrector, and may refer to simple pauses in the work of revision, or perhaps to pages either of the MS copied or of that used in the process of revision. In the actual case in question, the first pause was at the sixth page of the MS copied; while the proportion of the numbers 345 and 368, which are  $15 \times 23$  and  $16 \times 23$ , shows that the other two marks may be the conclusions of the 15th and 16th pages respectively of the *revising* MS.

The Urbinas MS has also other annotations of various kinds, the most prominent being the paragraph mark, a horizontal stroke against the beginning of the line where the pause is to be made. All these marks may be found quoted in Fuhr's article already referred to.

### *For Plato.*

Schanz<sup>1</sup> has discussed a precisely similar question for the Plato manuscripts. He remarks that the Bodleian Plato (Clarkianus) has partial stichometry in the Cratylus and Symposium, the letters running continuously to  $\psi$ . Counting the lines of Clarkianus between the successive marks, we have 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75; 71 being the most frequent interval. Now this gives us a *στίχος* of 35.56 letters for the Cratylus, and 34.32 for the Symposium, which are sufficiently in accord with M. Graux's results. Similar stichometric marks are found in another MS of Plato, Venetus 185 (Π of Bekker, D of Schanz.) Here again they are confined to Cratylus and Symposium. Between two following letters lie on the average 68 lines; and the same sections are marked off by the letters as in Clarkianus. An interesting application is made by Schanz to determine the authenticity of a passage in Cratylus 437d, where certain words are wanting in MSS B and T. We can at once verify that these words were wanting in the exemplar that supplied the stichometry.

W. Christ has studied in a similar manner the partial stichometry of Demosthenes<sup>2</sup> (Codex Bavaricus), and applied the results to

<sup>1</sup> Hermes, XVI 309, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> Die Atticusaussage des Demosthenes. München, 1882.



the preceding portion of the book. As are found in many early writers, who στίχοι precisely as we quote page and line. Schanz has given the name of Particulae.

Precisely as in the case of total MS notes have no special connection with the documents in which they occur, or to fixed and uniform numbers.

### For example,

For example, we have already seen Isocrates, Busiris, in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae, fol. 22, 10 (§25), before τοῖς τοῖς the letter R; between the letters R and S, which evidently represent the letters R and S. We ought also to find that in the 200 verses, the letters R and S.

of Demosthenes. and in the preface to the Acts, it is to have been ignored. He gave the references. The statement that the important than the content of the determination of the numbers from which the numbers

verses marked by hundred numbers in the Ambrosian Pentateuch; and measurement of the Acts and edition of Euthalius. Some of στίχοι are found in Diogenes are mostly in round numbers (τοὺς χιλίους στίχους), as the exemplars intermediate measurements more at length of the quotations in the similar quotations. There is no reason to the quotations made being circa tertium, and end instead of the per, sufficient actual method of citation by d, it was the only quotation.

elopment of the art of letters to one of and sentences, it instances of word-

lines corresponding to the well-established syl-

ables. They will have made their appearance first in those cases where the distinct enunciation of a sentence is required, with the object of removing the causes which impede the natural and vocal effect. That is, it is evident that in cases where texts are publicly recited, an effort will be made to render them more suitable to the task of reading orally a continuous text. This is seen with the works of the great orators, as well as with the lessons; and we may expect to find in such works a tendency in the direction of sense-lines rather than space-lines. In the first instance this tendency will only be manifested by the introduction of the paragraph mark, as it is found in the Hyperides MS, the MS of Isocrates, and the early Bible texts. But this paragraph mark, perhaps accompanied by a rude interpunction, is not found by the rhetoricians to be a sufficiently obvious and emphatic division of the text. Sense-lines are therefore introduced. The change seems to be made in the first case with a reservation that the text when broken up shall still represent the same number of lines, or sensibly as many, as the archaic copies. And the natural effect of such a change is that the *στίχος* undergoes a new deflection in the direction of *sentence*, the sentence being not very different from a hexameter.

The evidence for these statements may be arranged as follows: St. Jerome, at the commencement of his preface to Isaiah, informs his readers as to the nature of the book that he is translating.

“Nemo cum Prophetas versibus viderit esse descriptos metro eos aestimet apud Hebraeos ligari, et aliquid simile habere de Psalmis vel operibus Salomonis: sed *quod in Demosthene et Tullio solet fieri, ut per cola scribantur et commata*, qui utique prosa et non versibus conscripserunt, nos quoque *utilitati legentium* providentes, interpretationem novam *novo scribendi genere* distinximus.”<sup>1</sup>

St. Jerome introduces for the convenience of readers a new kind of transcription similar to that which was in vogue for Cicero and Demosthenes; this division of the text is by *cola* and *commata*. From Suidas<sup>2</sup> we find that when the *στίχος* forms a complete clause it is known as a colon: κῶλον οὖν ὁ ἀπηρτισμένην ἔννοιαν ἔχων στίχος.

From Joann. Sicul. in Hermog. i, 63 (Vol. VI, p. 127, Walz), we find that writing by *cola* and *commata* is the invention of rheto-

<sup>1</sup> Migne, Patrol. Lat. XXVIII, col. 771.

<sup>2</sup> s. v. κῶλον.

ricians in imitation of poetry: ὥστε ἐπειδὴ ποιητὰς οἱ ῥήτορες μιμοῦνται κῶλον λέγουσι τὸ ἀπὸ ἐννία συλλαβῶν ὡς μέχρι τῶν ἑπτακαίδεκα \* τὸ δὲ πλεον σχοινοτενὲς ὠνόμασται, κόμμα δὲ ἀπὸ μιᾶς μέχρι τῶν ὀκτώ. στίχους δὲ κοινῶς οὗτοι καλοῦσιν ἅπαντες εἰ μόνον ἀπαρτίζουσιν ἔννοιαν. In this passage it is interesting to observe that the standard of measurement is still the syllable, but, as we should expect, there is no longer a fixed number of syllables to a line, but we have three rough divisions; viz. if the clause be less than eight syllables it is called κόμμα, if between eight and seventeen it is called κῶλον, and if greater than this, σχοινοτενὲς or a long-drawn-out sentence. Such a long line is actually termed a verse in a quotation given by Vömel<sup>1</sup> from Aquila Romanus de Figuris c. 40: "Ponam . . . Demosthenicum versum; Et non dixi quidem haec . . . persuasi quidem." The passage (De Corona, §179) contains 20 words. We may actually see in operation the process of dividing the text of Demosthenes into κῶλα.

In a passage of the rhetorician Castor,<sup>2</sup> of the fifth century, we find the following:

Θήσομαι τὸν ἔκτον Δημοσθενικὸν λόγον τὸν ἐπιγραφέντα Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν Φιλίππου \* τοῦτον γὰρ στίξομεν, σὺν θεῷ φάναι, κατὰ κῶλον καταστήσαντες εἰς τὴν ποσότητα τῶν κῶλων κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν ἐγκείμενον ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις βιβλίοις, ὥς ἐμέτρησεν αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθενὴς τὸν ἴδιον λόγον.

Castor proposes, that is, to punctuate a passage of Demosthenes so that the numeration of the broken-up text may agree with the number of verses found in the old copies. Whether he supposes Demosthenes himself to have divided the text in this way, or whether he implies by the word ἐμέτρησεν a regular and uniform measure, is not very apparent at first sight; but a little consideration will show that it is not important to decide such a point, for it is sufficiently demonstrated that the stichometry of the MSS of Demosthenes is hexameter stichometry; and it must be the number of such verses that Castor wishes to preserve. Dionysius Halic. De Comp. Verb. XVIII gives explanations of the methods employed in breaking up the text of Demosthenes into cola and periods. For instance, in De Corona the first period is to consist of three cola, as follows:

τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγῳ, τρία μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ τὴν πρώτην περίοδον ἰ κῶλα \* οἱ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα καταμετροῦντες αἶδε εἰσὶν οἱ ῥυθμοί.  
' μὲν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις . . .

<sup>1</sup> Rhein. Mus. N. F. II 452.

<sup>2</sup> Walz. Rh. Gr. III 721.

Τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου κώλου τοῦδε.

Ὅσῃν εὖνοιαν ἔχων ἐγὼ διατελῶ τῇ τε πόλει καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν . . .

Τοῦ δὲ τρίτου κώλου,

Τοῦ τοσαύτην ὑπάρξαι μοι παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα.

It is evident that this custom of colon-writing introduces a measure of confusion into the subject ; the more so because colon-writing is sometimes accompanied by colometry, of which occasional traces may be found, as in Dionysius Hal.<sup>1</sup> who makes the proem to Thucydides up to οὐ χαλεπῶς ἀπανίσταντο to be 30 cola, and the beginning of the Aristocratea to be 9 cola. Misled by this peculiar dissection of the text at the hands of the rhetoricians, F. Blass<sup>2</sup> maintained strongly that the ancient στίχος was not a space-line but a sense-line. And with remarkable skill, which M. Graux honored with the term *habileté de main*, he proceeded to divide various passages, principally in Demosthenes, into a number of cola, sufficiently nearly in accord with the traditional number of verses.

Besides this, he reasoned that if the στίχος were a fixed quantity there ought to be a sensibly uniform ratio between the number of verses and the number of lines occupied in the printed text. This he maintained not to be the case.

In this, however, he seems to have failed almost completely, if we allow for the small margin of variation necessary in the measurement of the lines, and the small variations in the sizes of the Teubner pages to which he referred. A single instance will suffice. Taking the data for Herodotus, Blass gives :

	Στίχοι.	Teubner Lines.	Ratio.
Lib. IV	3253	2764	.849
Lib. V	2200	1866	.845
Lib. VIII	2322	1952	.840
Lib. IX	2206	1849	.842

If this does not demonstrate the use of a uniform verse-measure for Herodotus, it would be difficult to prove anything.

The merit of Blass' work consists, however, in the light it throws on the early rhetorical studies, and not at all in its bearing on stichometry. Blass himself, after making his colon division, came to the conclusion that the colon could not be very different from

<sup>1</sup> Dion. Hal. de Comp. pp. 169, 199.

<sup>2</sup> Zur Frage über die Stichometrie. Rhein. Mus. N. F. XXIV, 1869, p. 524.

the hexameter. "Die Zeilen sind mitunter lang, *aber selten länger als ein Hexameter.*"<sup>1</sup> "*Das rhetorische Colon entspricht dem poetischen Vers.*"<sup>2</sup> This is precisely what we should expect to find, for we have indicated that the colon was introduced as an alternative for the hexameter, and was made as far as possible equivalent to it. Another instance of this tendency, besides those which have been already quoted, is found in Cicero, Orat. 222: "E quattuor igitur (sc. membris) quasi hexametrorum instar versuum quod sit, constat fere plena comprehensio. His igitur singulis versibus quasi nodi apparent continuationis, quos in ambitu coniungimus."

Herodes Atticus<sup>3</sup> is said to have had a clepsydra made which was the time-equivalent of 100 hexameters, *συμμετρημένην ἐς ἑκατὸν ἔτη*, by means of which his enunciation was regulated.

### *Scrivener's pay and price of books.*

We now turn to the question of the employment of stichometric measurements in determining the pay of scribes and regulating the price of books. For investigations on this point the best researches are those of Graux and Birt.

It is established by means of the celebrated edict of Diocletian (A. D. 301), which was a tariff of maximum prices for the Roman empire, that the pay of scribes was by the hundred lines; and M. Graux very justly remarked that this assumed the fixity of the line, and would be altogether illusory upon any other hypothesis. I have discussed elsewhere the statements of this edict and their stichometric value.<sup>4</sup> It is only necessary, therefore, to give a brief recapitulation of the points thereby established. The edict from which the data are supplied is found in greater or less completeness in many localities, but the most important form is presented in an inscription from Stratonice; the figures being edited in the *Corpus Inscriptionum* from another inscription found in Phrygia. We have then:

Membranario in [qua]t[r]endone pedali pergamena.	[XL denarii]
Scriptori in scriptura optima versus No. centum.	[XXV]
Se[quentis] scripturae versuum No. centum.	[XX]
ni in scriptura libelli vel tabular[um] in	
as No. centum.	[X]

<sup>1</sup> P. 530.

<sup>2</sup> *Sophist.* II 10, p. 185, quoted by Wachsmuth, *Rhein. Mus.* 34.

<sup>4</sup> *American Journal of Philology*, 12, Suppl. p. 22 sqq.

It is clear from the inscription that there are at least two principal types of writing, if not a third; and in every case the measurement is by verses, no distinction being made or imagined between prose and poetry.

It is inconceivable that the difference in price should be due to a difference in the quality of the writing (as Birt suggests), for it would be somewhat difficult to graduate such uncertain things as the hands of scribes, to say nothing of dividing them exactly into good and bad; it must, therefore, be of different lengths of line that the edict speaks, *optimus* and *sequens* being the common terms all through the edict for first size and second size.

If the prices are correctly edited in the Corpus, the ratio 5 : 4 ( $\equiv 35 : 28$ ) is very nearly that of the normal hexameter to the normal iambic line, 36 : 28, which confirms our previous speculations as to the existence of the iambic lines. The difficulty in all such cases is to reduce the brass denarius of Diocletian's time into an equivalent of modern money. If we may take the values given by Birt<sup>1</sup> from Hultsch,<sup>2</sup> the payment is sufficiently small; 100 denarii being worth no more than 2.4 marks. The denarius is then .6 cent; the scribe's pay being 15 cents for a hundred hexameters and 12 cents for a hundred iambs. On this basis I have calculated the cost of production of the complete volume of which the Codex Sinaiticus forms a part; the result being approximately 180 dollars, the cost of the vellum being included.

It is not uncommon to find in early codices notes of the prices for which they were sold; Montfaucon (Bibl. Coislin. p. 57) observes that the price on the first leaf of a Psalter is *γρόσα δ'* = *grosa sive drachmae quatuor*; and at p. 83 he notes that codex 29 was bought for 24 *aspra*, the book itself being a commentary by Chrysostom on S. Paul's epistles.

A cursive MS of the Gospels (No. 444) sold in A. D. 1537 for 500 *aspra*; upon which Scrivener<sup>3</sup> notes that "the asper or asprum was a mediaeval Greek silver coin (derived from *ἄσπερος* = *albus*); we may infer its value from a passage cited by Ducange from Vincentius Bellovacus, XXX 75, 'quindecim drachmae seu asperos.'" Since the 4 Gospels are not more than twice as long again as the Psalms, it is difficult to see why the Psalter should

<sup>1</sup> Birt, p. 209.    <sup>2</sup> Hultsch. *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1880, Heft 1.

<sup>3</sup> Scrivener, Introduction to N. T., p. 208.

sell for 4 drachmae and the Gospels for 500. And it is possible that Montfaucon's price is incorrect.

M. Graux<sup>1</sup> gives us the further important information with regard to the pay of scribes, that the custom of regulating, if not the tariff, at least the measure of lines written, continued right into the middle ages, especially at Bologna and other university towns in Italy. He quotes Savigny,<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, to establish this point.

The unit of measure is the *pecia*, which consists of 16 columns, each containing 62 lines, and the number of letters in each line being 32. "Secundum taxationem studii bononiensis firmamus quod pecia constituetur ex sedecim columnis quarum quaelibet contineat sexaginta duas lineas et quaelibet linea litteras XXXII." The numbers here are peculiar, and it is extremely difficult to believe that as many as 62 lines were normally written on the page. It is interesting, however, to observe the survival of ancient custom in the columnar writing, and the measurement of lines by letters. The statute is, therefore, in all probability the relic and modification of previous laws.

Whether the line of 32 letters has any reference to the Italian poetry, as Birt suggests, is extremely doubtful. It is more likely to have been suggested as a multiple of the favorite number 16. We have no reason to suppose that such a statute as that mentioned required that MSS should actually be copied in columns or lines of the pattern indicated; all that was necessary was the adoption of this unit as the standard, and the record by the scribe of the number of peciae. M. Graux remarks that these notes of the scribe as to the progress of his work, "finis pecie I," are sometimes found in the body of the pages or the text.

Upon the whole, I am inclined to believe that the text of the statute is incorrect in reading sixty-two lines, a most improbable number. If we read 72 for 62, the pecia is almost exactly 1000 hexameters of 36 letters each; strictly speaking it is 1024. And this is an extremely likely unit of work to have been handed down by tradition from the early scribes.

An interesting survival of this early manner of determining the pay of a scribe is found in the modern custom among Indian copyists. Here the basis is the *çloka*, an iambic metre of 32 syl-

<sup>1</sup> *Revue de Philologie*, p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> T. III, c. xxv, §579.

### STICHOMETRY.

lables, which is applied as a unit of measurement to kinds.<sup>1</sup>

We shall now turn our attention to the bearing which we have upon the restoration of the early book-form, upon the texts of the New Testament. Thus far almost entirely any reference to the stichometric character of Biblical MSS, because they constitute so important a part of textual criticism that they deserve a separate discussion more complete than has hitherto been accorded them. For the same reason we have reserved any allusions to the stichometry of the New Testament.

J. REN

<sup>1</sup> Note by Dr. Bloomfield in Amer. Journ. Phil. 12, Suppl. by Gardthausen from Nöldeke, in Griech. Palaeogr. p. 132.

*(To be continued.)*



## II.—STUDIES IN PINDARIC SYNTAX.

### III.—AORIST AND IMPERFECT.

In older grammatical study there was much teleology. I do not mean merely teleological expression, for language was made by teleologists, who could not have understood any result without conscious agency somewhere. The final is always earlier than the consecutive; and even when the consecutive comes in, the final element may reappear at any moment. So the evolutionists are not to be assailed because they use the only vocabulary that the dynamic thinkers of the earliest days have left them; and the grammarians of the future will use to some extent the consecrated expressions of the past. But the attitude is changed, and though our grammars speak of certain forms, of certain phrases, as if the *demiurgos* of language had gone to work deliberately and framed forms and phrases to a clear end, we no longer wonder at the marvellous mechanism of speech. The most varied, most pliable, most subtle language on earth is only a congeries of survivals. The harmonies of speech are the result of the indolence of the human organs of utterance. The close texture of composition and inflexion is due to slurring impatience. At first, it is true, the scientific study of language heightened the admiration with which the faculty of speech was once regarded. The human mind, unscientific as well as scientific, delights in the variations produced by the combination of a few elements. Given a short list of radicals, a handful of terminations, and the language with all its arborescent growths is there. So the identification of the personal endings of the verb with the pronominal stems for *I, thou, that* seemed to our fathers a revelation. This revelation we look upon coldly now. We go a little way in Greek, for instance, and the scheme seems plausible. A little further, and we are perplexed beyond measure. The terminations seem to have wandered off from the bodies to which they originally belonged and to have grafted themselves on alien trunks. Primary endings attach themselves to stems which ought to have secondary endings—as  $-\mu$  of the optative—and secondary endings are equally capricious, as is shown by the second

person singular of the present indicative active. And so after many disillusionments we come down to the sober view that language serves its purpose only after a rude fashion. Physiologists have declared the eye as an optical instrument to be a wretched failure, and our students of linguistics smile at the enthusiasm which once clothed the subject of language with the purple light of rhetoric.

This changed attitude of the grammatical mind toward language may be illustrated by the treatment of function. In old times the grammarian cudgelled his brain to find the meaning common to all the functions of the ablative case. The principle that each form must have its function was a logical necessity. That any language which had once developed a form should lose it, should carelessly merge three or four forms into one, or use a dominant form for different functions, seemed impossible proceedings on the part of the personification called 'language.' Modern research has no scruples on that score, and goes so far, in fact, as to ignore utterly what remains of consciousness are preserved, not by the personification called language, but by the actual users of language. On the other hand, many distinctions which seemed to be rooted in the nature of things prove on examination to be mere afterthoughts. The early speakers put forth a variety of forms with no sharp distinction, and those that came after made a regular differentiation, sometimes on symbolic principles, sometimes on no discernible principle.

So while we have not a weltering chaos, we have no beautiful *κόσμος*. What we have may be something practically better than the fancied *κόσμος*, as it certainly is practically better than any *κόσμος* that human wit could devise. A compromise is often better than a thorough measure, and while our study has not the charm of logical symmetry, which the average individual of our race prefers, it has the charm of conscientiousness.

The distinction between imperfect and aorist is one of the old landmarks that have suffered from the closer study of language, and in exploring the borderland in which grammar and literary art meet, I have examined recently whether the Pindaric use of aorist and imperfect gives any reason to suspect any indifference on that score. Of course, in the ordinary school-grammars there is hardly a whisper of doubt as to the universality of the difference, and this may doubtless be considered sound practice. But if the student is to grapple with Homer—and he is generally introduced to Homer as soon as he can make out Xenophon's *Anabasis* without

frightful exertion—he will be met by the remarkable statement of commentary and text-book that it often does not matter which is used. So La Roche on B 43 copies from Krüger Di. §53, 2, 1, a long list of indifferences. Krüger says that the choice is often arbitrary, often dictated by metrical considerations. So we find without ‘any considerable difference’ βαῖνον and βῆ, A 437 and 439; βάλλετο and βάλετο, B 43 and 45; θῆκεν and ἐτίθει, Ψ 653 and 656, ε 265. 267; δῶκε and δίδου, H 303 and 305; λίπε and λείπε, B 106 and 107; still more striking is μίστυλλον side by side with ὥπτησαν περιφραδέως, A 465. All these are given in the same order by Professor Goodwin in his Moods and Tenses; only Krüger’s ‘erheblicher Unterschied’ becomes ‘perceptible difference,’ and the indifference is referred to the meaning of the verb, an explanation which lacks clearness. It is a little remarkable that Delbrück, in his Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax, takes βαίνειν and βῆναι and βάλλειν and βαλεῖν as striking examples of the Homeric differentiation of durative and aoristic tenses; δίδοναι and δοῦναι are sharply distinguished elsewhere.

In prose the MSS are sometimes to blame for the confusion of ἔλειπον and ἔλιπον, but there is a translatable difference everywhere, and it is hard to admit, without better evidence, that Homer, so exact in the use of the tenses, should have admitted the imperfect *metri causa*, though *metri causa* is coming to honor again. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the attempts to constitute a difference of conception are often lamentable in the extreme, and it would be better simply to note the difficulty as a problem than to hazard such breakneck mental positions as commentators sometimes indulge in. After all the preaching that has been done on the subject of the tenses, grammarians, the sermon over, are apt straightway to forget that the imperfect has nothing to do with the absolute length of the action, it has only to do with the vision of the narrator. So Nägelsbach’s notion that the imperfect might refer to the abiding character of the result, though almost demonstrably false, has been echoed by so good a scholar as Classen. So rooted is the tendency in beginners to consider imperfect ‘prolonged’ and aorist ‘momentary’ that a course of εὐθύς with the imperfect and of high numbers with the aorist is necessary to get them into right habits of thought; but certainly veteran scholars ought not to be tangled with such formulae.

What I wish to bring out in these remarks is the substantial justification of the difference between imperfect and aorist, from an

aesthetic point of view. Let it be conceded that the imperfect is nothing more than an aorist which has a present indicative, whereas the second aorist has no such present indicative. The present indicative is associated in the mind of the Greek with the idea of duration. He has no aoristic present, as a matter of fact, in the crystallized language. If he wishes to express the notion, he must use the aorist indicative as an approximation. Otherwise he must let the aoristic idea come out as best it may from the environment. It is useless to inquire into an earlier type. Contrasted groups such as *φεύγω* and *ἔφυγον*, *λείπω* and *ἔλιπον* preserved clear samples of durative and complexive, and that is enough from the point of view of the users of language. *ἔτρεφε* was as durative as *ἔφευγε*. First aorist and second aorist, though formed on different principles, unite in the complexive notion—the first aorist keeping for itself the special notion of ingress. First aorist and second aorist, then, we may regard as one, so far as the contrast to the imperfect is concerned, and they are so regarded in the statistics I am about to submit—statistics which seem to show how intimate is the association of aesthetics and grammar.

Of course, in separating aorist from imperfect, difficulties and doubts arise. Some of the old preterites, ordinarily classed among the imperfects, may fairly be claimed as aorists or indifferents. So<sup>1</sup> *ἦν* may be considered indifferent, and *ἔφην* is decidedly aoristic. Then there are variations in reading, coincidences of form, *ἄμυνεν* and *ᾠτρυνεν*, and the balance produced by durative and complexive forms of the verb, outside of the indicative, has also to be considered, so that the investigation is laborious—laborious out of all proportion to the possible result. Still, having begun with a few characteristic odes, I was encouraged to continue; and now that the work is done,

<sup>1</sup> *φάς* is aoristic. Clearly so Il. 9, 35; 14, 126; not so clearly Il. 3, 44. In Attic all ambiguity is removed by the bifurcation into *φάσκων* and *φήσας*. *φάμενος* has no offsetting middle of *φάσκω*, and, while *ἔφατο* is clearly aoristic, *φάμενος* may be durative (cf. Hdt. 1, 176; 2, 22. 28. 148. 174; 3, 31. 68. 69. 74. 75 *bis*, etc.). In Pindar *φαμένω* (I 5, 47) is complexive, while *παρφαμένα* (N 5, 31) would naturally be considered durative: *πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν* (Schol. *ἐλιτάνευε καὶ παραπείθειν ἐπεχείρει συνελθεῖν αὐτή*). The whole subject of these early verbs is full of difficulties. So a long chapter might be written on *ἦα* and its forms. In Homer the group is aoristic. In Attic the absence of an imperfect to *ἔρχομαι*, as well as the presence of *εἰμι*, forced on the group an imperfect sense which commentators (e. g. Classen on Thuk. 1, 2, 4; 3, 22, 2) have not failed to develop.

it may be worth while to register the facts, without putting sledge-hammer emphasis on the conclusions.

The logaoedic and the dactylo-epitrite odes of Pindar differ from each other in many points, one might say in every point in which the law of the epinikion and the individuality of the poet are not involved. It is not necessary to expand on this familiar theme. The organic difference which expresses itself in the rhythm, expresses itself in the build of the poem, the development of the story, the order of the words. Why not in the use of the tenses? The quicker measures of the logaoedics would seem to call for more short forms and consequently for more second aorists. Pindar himself, when he is professedly quickening his pace in the narrative, multiplies aorists,<sup>1</sup> and almost tells us that he considers the aorist complexive. Should we not expect, then, to find in the myths of the dactylo-epitrites a larger proportion of imperfects, in the logaoedics a larger proportion of aorists? Of course the aorist will preponderate in both classes. That is the rule of the language. And regard must be had also to special emergencies. The law of the rhythm is crossed by the necessities of the story. There may be dactylo-epitrite stories that demand sharp, rapid handling. The poet may pause for leisurely contemplation in the logaoedic. But taking a sufficient basis for induction, we find that on the whole the proportion of imperfects to aorists in the dactylo-epitrites rises in a marked degree—a proportion that can not be seriously affected by recount, by elimination of errors.

I cannot pause to justify the selection I have made out of the forty-odd Pindaric odes. Pindaric scholars will understand most of the omissions. I have limited myself to the narratives, and have counted in them, not only imperfects and aorists, but also duratives and complexives outside of the indicative. After a rough preliminary count, which led me to think that a more exact examination would be remunerative, I requested Mr. C. W. E. Miller, Scholar of the Johns Hopkins University, to go over the ground carefully, and compare his lists with the result of my second examination. In this way, it is hoped, most of the errors have been eliminated. The result is the following table—worked out by Mr. Miller. The references are to Christ's edition (Teubner).

<sup>1</sup> See P 4, 247: *μακρά μοι νείσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα γὰρ συνάπτει καί τινα | οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν.* From this point to the end of the story, P. has eight aorists and but a single imperfect. Contrast the statistics of P 4 given below.

			INDICATIVE.			MODAL.		
			Imp.	Aor.	Ratio.	Dura.	Compl.	Ratio.
LOGAORDIC.								
O 1	25-92	Story of Pelops	6	23	1 : 3.833	11	16	1 : 1.454
O 9	42-79	Pyrrha and Deukalion	3	12	1 : 4	5	11	1 : 2.2
O 10 (11)	24-77	First Ol. games	6	18	1 : 3	9	10	1 : 1.111
O 13	63-92	Bellerophon	2	12	1 : 6	11	8	1 : .727
P 2	21-48	Ixion	3	15	1 : 5	9	3	1 : .333
P 5	55-95	Coming of Battos	2	11	1 : 5.5	6	5	1 : .833
P 6	28-42	Antilochos	2	6	1 : 3	3	4	1 : 1.333
P 8	39-56	Alkmaion		4	0 : 4	3	4	1 : 1.333
P 10	31-48	Perseus	1	4	1 : 4	4	4	1 : 1
P 11	17-37	Orestes	1	9	1 : 9	4	4	1 : 1
N 3	33-64	Aiakidai	9	7	1 : .777	10	5	1 : .5
N 4	54-68	Peleus	2	5	1 : 2.5	1	3	1 : 3
N 6	53-61	Aiakidai		4	0 : 4	1	2	1 : 2
N 7	27-48	Aiakidai	3	10	1 : 3.333	6	2	1 : .333
I 7	17-60	Achilles	8	19	1 : 2.375	14	10	1 : .714
			48	159	1 : 3.3125	97	91	1 : .938
DACTYLO-EPITRITE.								
O 3	13-38	Finding of Olive	5	9	1 : 1.8	7	5	1 : .714
O 6	29-70	Story of Iamos	6	18	1 : 3	12	14	1 : 1.166
O 7	27-76	Founding of Rhodes	6	21	1 : 3.5	9	20	1 : 2.222
O 8	31-53	Story of Aiakos	4	5	1 : 1.25	7	5	1 : .714
P 3	7-58	Story of Koronis	4	24	1 : 6	13	18	1 : 1.384
P 4	70-262	Argonauts	37	66	1 : 1.783	57	61	1 : 1.07
P 9	5-70	Kyrene	6	13	1 : 2.166	14	16	1 : 1.143
P 12	6-23	Origin of Flute	2	7	1 : 3.5	4	5	1 : 1.25
N 1	35-72	Infant Herakles	4	14	1 : 3.5	6	12	1 : 2
N 5	9-39	Aiakidai	9	8	1 : .888	5	9	1 : 1.8
N 9	11-27	Adrastos	5	5	1 : 1	5	8	1 : 1.6
N 10	4-18	Glory of Argos	0	9	0 : 9	3	4	1 : 1.333
I 1	17-31	Kastor and Iolaos	3	4	1 : 1.333	4	1	1 : .25
I 3	15-37	Kleonymidai	2	7	1 : 3.5	5	1	1 : .20
I 4	19-42	Aiakidai	0	6	0 : 6	5	1	1 : .20
I 5	24-56	Aias and his sire	1	13	1 : 13	4	10	1 : 2.5
		Total Dactylo-Epitrite	94	229	1 : 2.436	160	190	1 : 1.1875
		Total Logaoedic	48	159	1 : 3.3125	97	91	1 : .938
			142	388	1 : 2.732	257	281	1 : 1.093

It will be seen at a glance that the aorist preponderates in both classes. This is the rule everywhere, must be the rule in lyric poetry. The lyric poet is unrelenting. He does not linger, he only touches on the *κεφάλαια λόγων* (P 4, 116). It is of the essence of his profession that he is not to weary his hearers; he must speed from theme to theme as a bee from flower to flower, as a ship from shore to shore (P 10, 51), as an eagle from quarry to quarry. We cannot expect the lingering imperfect. Even the slowest measures will hardly tolerate a leisurely unfolding. Only when the long voyage of the Argonauts slackens the flight of the poet, or when he pauses to watch the rearing of Achilles, favorite theme with all the Aiakidai, does the imperfect mount, does the imperfect surpass. The statelier measures, of course, favor the imperfect, but the stateliness of

the measure is often tempered by the brevity of the myth. Most of the Isthmians are dactylo-epitrite, but the story of Aias and his father is a long one for the compass of the ode (I 5, 24-56), and there is a note of impatience at the end (v. 56): *ἐμοὶ δὲ μακρὸν πάσας ἀναγῆσασθ' ἀπεράς*. We must be content with approximate results. Absolute uniformity would be fatal to vitality. If every dactylo-epitrite were full of imperfects, if every logaoedic abounded in aorists, that might gratify a certain sense of the fitness of things. It is enough that it is the rule. The rhythm is not all. We have to consider the bulk of the poem, the proportion of the narrative to bulk. Sometimes the poet says to himself *τρία ἔπεα διαρκέσει*, and that must suffice us even in a long poem.

Pick and choose and you can prove anything. So it might be said that a logaoedic poem will show the highest run of imperfects, a dactylo-epitrite the highest run of aorists. In I 5 (dactylo-epitrite) there is but one imperfect to thirteen aorists. In N 3 (logaoedic) the imperfects outnumber the aorists more than they do in N 5 (dactylo-epitrite). But take all the figures and see how persistently the logaoedics continue on the high ranges. Leaving out Mr. Miller's third decimal place as too cumbrous, we find:

<i>Logaoedic.</i>		<i>Dactylo-Epitrite.</i>	
Impf.	Aor.	Impf.	Aor.
		O : 9	N 10
		O : 6	I 4
O : 4	P 8, N 6		
I : 9	P 11	I : 13	I 5
I : 6	O 13	I : 6	P 3
I : 5.50	P 5		
I : 5	P 2		
I : 4	O 9 P 10		
I : 3.83	O 1		
		I : 3.50	O 7, P 12, N 1, I 3
I : 3.33	N 7		
I : 3	O 10 (11), P 6	I : 3	O 6
I : 2.50	N 4		
I : 2.37	I 7		
		I : 2.16	P 9
		I : 1.80	O 3
		I : 1.78	P 4
		I : 1.33	I 1
		I : 1.25	O 8
		I : 1	N 9
		I : .88	N 5
I : .77	N 3		

The clustering speaks for itself.

STUDIES IN PINDARIC SYNTAX.

As has been intimated, a careful calculation will take into account the effect of the durative and complexive of the indicative. An aorist infinitive in oratio obliqua is as much as an indicative aorist, and is selected on the same principle as much as the indicative aorist, and it may be maintained that as the difference between *ἔφηνον* and *ἔφηνοναι* is a mere matter of kind of time and not of mood, so aor. subj. *φύγω* and pres. subj. *φείγω* give the same effect as *ἔφηνον*, the other as *ἔφηνοναι*. If students distinguish between aor. and imperf. indic., they may distinguish with equal sharpness between the present inf. But after all the indicative gives the main lines of the mood, only the shading; and this comes out very clearly if we treat the figures already gained in a different way.

If we lump imperfects and duratives as durative, and complexives as complexives, the difference between the two classes of poems will be reduced. In the logaoedic poems 145 duratives against 250 complexives (about 1 : 1.72), in the dactylo-epitrites, 254 duratives against 419 complexives (about 1 : 1.65). This is a warning against the straining of the theory to make ever just that theory may be.

B. L. GILL



### III.—WORDS FOR COLOR IN THE RIG VEDA.<sup>1</sup>

A grave responsibility rests upon philologists. The so-called color theory, which assumes that the human eye was incapable three or four thousand years ago of perceiving certain colors of the spectrum (chiefly green and blue) that are now clearly seen and distinguished, has been abandoned by Magnus, who was in this respect the representative of physical science. Philology, therefore, remains alone in its support of this theory; and it is mainly through the writings of two philologists, Gladstone (on the color-sense in Homer) and Geiger (on color in Rig Veda, Zend Avesta, etc.) that this responsibility has been incurred. The latter author has been received as authority and upheld by Weise (*Farbenbezeichnungen*, *Bezenb. Beiträge* II, 273 fig.), and the essay in question (Geiger: *Ursprung und entwicklung der menschlichen Sprache und Vernunft*, Bd. II, 3tes Buch) is quoted by the non-philological world generally as proving that the disputed colors were *actually* not mentioned in the Rig Veda, and were in all probability unknown at that time; in Geiger's own words, 'the men of that time did not and could not call anything blue.'

Of all the literatures which have been dealt with in this connection, those of Greece and India are paramount in importance, for the others (Koran, Hebrew Bible, Zend Avesta, etc.) are either not so early a growth or are less extensive or less distinctively national.

It is the object of this paper to inquire into the correctness of Geiger's deductions, and in doing this the writer may state at the outset that from an independent investigation of the color words in the Rig Veda he was led not only to question the facts adduced by Geiger, but also to doubt whether his application of these facts (even if proved) be admissible.

In Part I is subjoined the occurrence and application of all color words found in the Rig Veda (Geiger treats in detail only the disputed colors), and in Part II some remarks have been added in regard to the results deducible from the use of color words in the Rik, the methods of Geiger, and the inferences to be drawn from this special study in regard to the color theory in general.

<sup>1</sup> An Essay read before the American Oriental Society in New York, Oct. 1882.

## PART I.

§1. On examining the words in the Rig Veda which indicate color, we notice as in other languages that there are a great number of epithets which, strictly speaking, are not designations of color at all, but simply imply or suggest it, and, furthermore, that the optical effect thus suggested is always white, while the simple idea of glancing, shining, dazzling is generally fundamental to this attempt to reproduce by verbal signs the most striking effect which light produces on the retina. Foremost among such words in the Rik are the derivatives formed from the roots *arc* and *bhā*. The first of these gives us *arci*, *arcis*, that which glances, flame (cf. *arka*), and thence *arc*, *arcin*, *arcimant*, *arcivant*, employed as epithet of the *Açvins* and *Maruts* and of the "flaming" stars; the adj. *arcin* in *arcinā padā* seems to indicate the rapid movement of the feet, but in *arcā māsā* it is the shining of the moon that is prominent, and *arcaddhūma* illustrates the adjective force of the participle "(fires) of which the smoke glances." It is possible that we have also in the word *ṛkṣa*, bear, *ῥῥκτος*, which Kuhn regards as derived from the same root, an allusion to its gleaming (reddish) color. It is at any rate noteworthy that in the epic poetry we find the same word used to indicate the color of horses distinct from white (*Mbhā* VII 132, 30) *ṛkṣavarṇāḥ hayāḥ karkair miçrāḥ* (bear-colored steeds mingled with white ones). If this be the case we have here an example of what will be noticed below, where words have evolved from a root that contained in itself no idea of color a distinct color sense, through applying derivatives of such roots to objects that have color. The second root, *bhā*, indicates the general idea of glance. The adjectives and compounds derived from it (*bhāmin* of *Agni* and clouds; the substantives *bhās*, *bhāma*; *bhāsas* of *Agni*; *vibhā* of *Uṣas*; *vibhānu* of *Agni*; *vibhāvan* of *Agni* and *Uṣas* with the feminine form *vibhāvarī* of *Uṣas* and as substantive in the later language "the bright," i. e. night; *vibhāvasu* of *Agni*) contain no idea of color more complex than that of simple glance or brilliancy.<sup>1</sup> We may say the same of the derivatives of *div* (*dyu*), *dyumat* (of *Agni*, *Soma* and other gods, the chariot, etc., as well as in other applications where it is difficult to say if clearness of glance and tone or beauty in general is meant),

<sup>1</sup>Although *vibhāvarī* occurs in the meaning "yellow ginger," yet this use is common to all words meaning night, and the idea of yellow in this application is later and foreign to the Rik.

dyumna (glance) and its compounds, together with didyut and vidyut (lightning), cf. sudyut and possibly sudina (of the day and the morning) unless the derivation from *dī*, shine, be rejected and sudina be only *dina* in composition as *purudina* and *madhyam̐dina*. None of these has a developed meaning, nor is there in the Rik any instance of their use where the simple idea root is not sufficient explanation of the sense. Another root which may perhaps be included under *arc* (= *arj*) shows two distinct inclinations, if we may so speak, first, that expressed in *arjuna*, which preserves throughout the root-meaning of shining, and is applied to the day (*ahar*), the thunderbolt (*vajra*), the dawn (*Uṣas*), etc., in opposition not only to black (*kṛṣṇa*), but also to the yellow gold color (*piç-aṅga*). In the same way *rajata*, another derivative from the same root, occurs once in the Rik in the meaning glancing (white), and in the later literature acquires as substantive the meaning glancing-white-metal (silver, compare the unconscious pleonasm of Horace, *argenti splendor*). The other inclination of which we spoke is that shown in *ṛjra* which stands in relation to *arj* as *ṛkṣa* to *arc*. The idea of glancing passes into that of glancing-red, and even the darker red (distinguished from *rajata* and *aruṣa*) is so indicated, the application of the word being chiefly to horses (cf. *ṛjrāçva*), the celestial steeds, and to fire (compare *ṛjriya* of *agniyoni*, and *ṛjiti* of offering, beams, etc., and *ṛjika* variegated). Of like origin are the words *rajas* the sky, and *rajanī*, night, in reference to the shining stars (cf. *prabhātāyām rajan-yām*). Among the verbs of shining, glancing we must include the most frequent of them, *vas*, with its many derivatives (*uṣr*, *uṣ*, *uṣas*, the aurora); the adj. formed from the same stem, *vivasvan*, *vivasvat*, and the possibly connected *usra*, *usriga*, *uṣṛ*, *uṣṛa*, all of which unite the idea of glancing to the indistinct suggestion of the red glow of morning, and so substantively the dawn; or to that of the red gleam of ox and steer, etc., and so substantively ox, buffalo. But in all these cases simple glance is the fundamental meaning.

*Bhrāja* from *bhrāj* (fulgeo) used of the sun (cf. *agnibhrājas* = *ignis fulgor*, and *bhṛgu*); *rājin*, contained in *a-rājin* of mountains; *pājasvat* from *pājas* (*sahasra*°) gleam (cf. *pr̥thu*°) are not used often or clearly enough to see if any idea further than that of glancing has been reached by them. Two more examples complete this list where the color idea is marked enough to be noted by the addition of that word (*varṇa*). The first is *candra* from *cand*, to shine, especially called the *candravarṇa*, and this developed color

is not reddish but yellowish, so that it is the moon-color, as, indeed, *candramas* is the moon and *candram* is gold. It is used with *hiranya* (golden) of divinities, garments, fire, etc. (cf. *hariścandra*, *çcandra* being the older form of the word). It is found again compounded with *puru* (*puruścandra*) of deities, sky and chariot. Like the *candravarṇa* is the *ruçanvarṇa*, from *ruc* to glance, which characterizes the (yellow) glancing soma. From the root-meaning shine which appears in *ruc* and its derivatives *rukṣa*, glancing (of Agni) *roka*, light, *virukmat*, *viroka* (once in *viroke uṣasas*) and *virokin*, the glancing (of divinities) we find an apparent approach to distinct color in *rukma*, the shining (-yellow, gold) and in the ptc. form *ruçat* (λευκός) which is, as color, opposed to *çyāva* (brown) and *kṛṣṇa* (black) and is particularly termed a color in the compound with *varṇa* given above, with which we may again compare the compounds *ruçatpaçu* (*uṣas*) "who has glancing herds," referring to the red or yellow clouds (cf. *ruçadgo*, *ruçat* of *dhāsi*, milk, and *ruçadvatsa*) and *ruçadūrmi* (the fire) "which has glancing yellow or red waves (flames)." Other forms in the Rik are *vasuruc*, *vasurocis*, which (whether from *Vasu* (B. R.) or *vasu* as simple adj.) exhibit the two roots *vas* and *ruc* compounded together.

One root is found, the primary signification of which is doubtful: *çvit*, if it mean simply to shine, belongs here. B. R. give the meaning "be white," while Weise, in the essay referred to above, insists on the fundamental meaning "to burn." The adjective formed from this, *çveta* (opposed to *kṛṣṇa*, cf. Zend *spaeta*, Gothic *hveita*, Eng. white) means simply white, and is so used as epithet of the gods, the white steeds of Agni, the *kalaça* (elsewhere *hiranyasya kalaçaḥ*), while in later literature applied to *parvatāḥ*, the mountains, *çveta* describes the appearance of the snow. So too *çvitra* is later the white leprosy and *çvitrin* in *Manu* is leper. Compare with these *çvitici*, *çvitna*, *çvitnya*, *çvityaṅc*, *çvetya*, and also the substantive *çvetanā*, the lighting up of the dawn (like *sūryaçvit*). In all these words whiteness is the color expressed, if indeed any real color is expressed (*sūryaçvit* contains a second idea of glance in so far as *sūrya* itself is ultimately only the glancing, *svar-sūr*). On the other hand the form *çyeta* seems to mean reddish white, as the feminine *çyenī* is the aurora, and the adj. itself is applied to the colors that appear at the rising and the setting of the sun, and to the fire. In *çyena*, eagle, we have possibly the same word. According to Indian authorities *çyeta* itself is regarded as equivalent to *çveta*, white. Whether *çyāma*, black,

is from this root is doubtful, the word does not occur in the Rik, and the apparent contradiction of white and black could be explained only by granting Weise's proposed rendering of *çvit*, etc., as denoting the color of burning (glancing and thus white) and burned (so black) as in Germ. blank against Eng. black.

There are, however, other methods of forming adj. of color than by developing the idea of red from roots meaning glance. Weise has sought to prove that the original and most primitive color words arose from roots which signify to burn (namely, *çvit* and *ghar*), but in the Rig Veda we cannot resolve the roots meaning "shine" back into a more primitive "burn," except in isolated cases, and outside of these we find other roots which have at first neither of these ideas, but which form similar color words. Among these are the derivatives from *ci*, *ki*, and *cit*, where the original meaning is that of perception. From the idea 'this object is perceptible,' we have as the next step 'this object is conspicuous, bright,' and so we arrive at the idea of brightness, glance, gleam, and this in turn develops into the more distinct notion of color. In such examples we have, to be sure, the idea of glance preceding that of color, but not as the ultimate meaning. So *citra*, from *cit*, is used to characterize gold, garments, chariots, as well as divinities and the sky (cf. *ex gr.* I 115, 1, *citram devānām anikam*), while in the post-Vedic language it means variegated. Other Rik forms from this root are *cetana*, *cetas*, *vicetas*, where the meaning is uniformly that of bright, sparkling. Similar is the growth of those words of which *ketu*, glancing (banner), is a specimen, from *ci* (*ki*) to perceive; cf. *ketumat*, *sahasraketu* (of the chariot of deities). It may be questioned whether real color enter into the meaning of these derivatives at all, as they stand in relation to the developed root meaning shine much as *candidus* in Latin does to *candeo*.

The same process whereby 'perceptible' develops into 'glancing' and possibly thence into an idea of color, is gone through with by roots meaning 'be pure.' Thus *çundhyu*, bright, clear, used as epithet of the sun's horses, is derived from *çudh* (*çundh*) purify (*καθ-αρός*). Thus also from *pū* (Lat. *purus*) to be pure, clean, we have *pāvaka*, used of Agni, Varuṇa, Aurora, etc., not only to denote "purifier," but also to express the gleaming color-effect which is more expressly indicated in *pāva*, found, as it is, only in connection with *hiranya* (golden), to describe the soma (*hiranyapāva*). Like these words which denote brightness by an idea of purity are the negatives *adhvasvan*, *aripra*, *arepas*, used of physical

objects and meaning literally spotless. With all of these we may place the root *çuc* and its derivatives often employed in union with *pāvaka*. The noun *çuci* and the adjectives *çukra* (*çukla*) denote glance, brightness (cf. *çucivarna*, *çukra-varna* and substantive *çocis*, *çoka*, etc.) and express the idea of brightly adorned, as does *çubhra*, a similar word meaning either clear-shining or well-adorned, and, in the later language, white, while in *çona* (especially of fire and the steeds of the deities) we have the idea of red predominating, which later gives the neuter substantive *çonitam* the meaning blood. It is, however, doubtful if *çona* be connected with *çuc* at all.

Again, in *çukrapiç* we have another train of thought in developing the color idea. This *piç*, which in *piçāṅga* and *piçāṅgarūpa* has developed into the meaning gold-color (cf. *hiraṇyapeça*) or yellow-brown (contrasted with *arjuna*) and characterizes divinities, rays of the sun, etc., has as ultimate meaning the idea "adorn," prepare (by cutting), decorate, as in *peça* and *supeça*, and this decoration is applied to color in *piçāṅga* (and possibly in *piça*, the (red) stag. Possibly the same idea is to be found in *suçilpa*, once applied to day and night, from *çilpa*, adornment, in the sense 'well-adorned,' and so 'many-colored' (so B. R.)

Beside these we find in one, perhaps two forms, that the idea of sharpness may be capable of a similar development. The first of these is *tejiṣṭha*, properly a superlative adj. from *tij*, be sharp; from the meaning of very sharp we have first the idea of hot and then of sparkling. The primitive idea is seen in its application to the rays of the sun which are sharp or hot, while in limiting water (soma-drop) we have the transformation into glancing; the gleam is piercing bright, cf. *dhārā agneḥ* the glare (sharpness) of fire. Possibly too, *tapu* may belong here.

Under *çvit* we have purposely omitted *çiti* in its Rig Veda compounds *çitipad* and *çitiprṣṭha* (the word is not found in the Rik uncompounded). It is doubtful if this word is derived from *çi*, burn (*çuçvit*) or from *çā*, to sharpen (so Grassmann). Not only the derivation but even the meaning of this word is matter of dispute, as it may mean either white or black (v. above under *çvit*). *Çitiprṣṭha* is applied to the steeds of Indra and figuratively to milk, *çitipad* is epithet of chariot and the brown steeds (*çyāva*) of Savitar. The assumed double meaning of *çiti* may have been the result of the later *çitikanṭha* used with *nīlakanṭha* as epithet of Rudra. In the later form *çita* B. R. assume a confusion of *ç* with *s*, *sita* being a



post-Vedic word for white. Another development of the glancing, shining idea (if not of positive color) is to be seen in *tviṣimant*, *tveṣa* and the substantive *tviṣi*, where the simple root denotes only rapid movement, and thence glance. These adjectives are applied to fire, the countenance of the Maruts, the rays of the sun, etc., while the substantive expresses an attribute (glance) of fire and sun.

We leave this division with the remark that *rudra*, which in Grassmann is said to mean glancing, must, to effect this, be derived from a suppositious root, *rud* to shine, and *phalgva* (*phalgu*) said by Grassmann to be 'reddish' is defined by B. R. in accord with its derivation from *phalgu*, weak, worthless.

§2. We pass in this division to those words where the first color of the spectrum, red, begins to be indicated by direct comparison with red objects. First we mention *agnirūpa*, fire-color, like *agni-ṣrī* (of the glory of fire), *ṣrī* itself (cf. *hariṣrī*) meaning glory, beauty. Both of these terms are applied to the storm-gods, like *varcas* (glory) and its compounds. So *indhanvan*, having the brilliancy of lighted fuel, and *indhana* (cf. *αἰθων*) of the clouds (*dhenu*). The root *indh* means to burn, to light a fire. Similar in sense is *aṅgāra*, a coal, so called from its fiery appearance (*añj*, adorn, glow, shine, Grassmann) and in the later language one of the names of the "red planet Mars." Perhaps the best of the few examples in this list is *rohita* (later *lohita*), from the root *\*rudh*, to be red, which underlies *rudhira* (A. V.) blood. The shorter form *rohit* appears as feminine substantive in the meaning 'red mare,' and the feminine *rohiṇī* shows a like usage. The short form occurs again in the compound *rohidaṣva*, and as adjective *rohita* is generally applied to cattle and horses (*hari*, *praṣṭi*, *vājin*); while substantively *rohita* means a horse, just as *lodha* (from the form with *l* like *lohita*) means a red animal. *Kalmalikin*, said to mean flaming, as epithet of *Rudra*, is derived from *kalmali*, gleam (*vielleicht glanz* B. R.) which occurs in A. V.

Together with these we may place the word *su-kimṣuka*, derived from the *kimṣuka*, a tree with red blossoms. The adj. thus formed by the prefix *su* (εῖ) is said by Grassmann and B. R. to mean 'beautifully ornamented with blossoms of the *kimṣuka* tree.' The adjective occurs, however, only as epithet of *sūryā* (figuratively as *ṣalmali* with the epithets *viṣvarūpa* and *hiraṇyavarṇa*) and in the *Nirukta* (quoted by B. R.) the adjective is explained by *sukāṣana*, fair to see. It seems to me probable that we have here a direct

comparison with the main characteristic of this tree—its red appearance, as in the following with the characteristic of gold (*hiranya*). This use we may illustrate from the later language, since the form is so isolated in the Rig Veda, and by comparing the epithet with Mbhā. IX 58, 34, we can understand how the red blossoms of this tree provoke a direct comparison of color. The epic passage is as follows:

. . . rudhirenā 'bhisamplutau  
Dadṛcāte himavati puṣpitāv iva kimṇukau.

(The two warriors) dripping with blood looked like two *kimṇuka* trees blooming on the mount of snow; or again, XIII 30, 43: "down fell the warriors, wet with blood their limbs, like two *kimṇuka* trees cut down." Like this is also XII 166, 62-3: "And the foul earth grew all filled with bodies dripping with blood like hills with *kimṇuka* trees." So in the Rig Veda passage it seems to me that the *tertium comparationis* is rather the fiery red common to both the sun's chariot and the tree's blossoms. We have in another form *sūryatvac* (cf. *hiranyatvac*) an attempt to express the color of the Maruts by referring their appearance to that of the sun, cf. *sūro varṇah* (IV 5, 13) and the two forms *sūryaraçmi*, *sūryaçvit*; and this word expresses also the glance of a chariot or the radiance of a goddess.

§3. Words for red and yellow, or reddish-yellow, which are not the result of comparison with physical objects and are not derived from roots meaning glance, etc.

Foremost among these is *aruṇa* (cf. *aruṇapsu*) red, bright-brown, golden-yellow. Any distinct standard whereby we may estimate the exact worth of this adjective is wanting. It is applied to the dawn, the sun, the soma (plant), the color of the wolf and cattle, and means as substantive the red-yellow cow (dawn). As compound adj. it appears in *aruṇāçva*, of the horses (cf. *aruṇī*) of the Maruts, and as *varṇa* (I 73, 7, *naktāca cakrur uṣasā virūpe kṛṣṇamīca varṇam aruṇamīca saṁdhuḥ*) is the glow of dawn in antithesis to the blackness of night. Similar to this in form and meaning is *aruṣa*, which is the fiery red of the thunderbolt, the fire, the steeds of Agni (cf. of Agni *aruṣastūpa*, with red flame), the sun, the dawn, and is found like *aruṇa* in the fem. as substantive, *aruṣī*, meaning red cow (dawn). *Aruṇa* (in *aruṇahan*) is perhaps (B. R.) only another form of the same word. With both of these compare the compounds *tryaruṇa*, *tryaruṣa*, the first being a proper name, the second used as epithet of cattle, 'red in three places.' With these,



and in sense closely related, stands *bradhna*, light red, and yellow which is used as epithet of fire, soma, and of the sun's horses. It occurs but infrequently and with no great variety of application. In an interesting compound of this word (*çatabradhna*) *bradhna* seems to denote the shining metal end of Indra's weapon (*iṣu*). Six colors, we are told (X 20, 9), accompany Agni the fire god: *kṛṣṇaḥ çveto 'ruṣo yāmo asya (agneḥ) bradhnah ṛjra uta çona yaçasvān*. This list includes many of the words discussed above, and it is safe to say that there is not (with the exception of *kṛṣṇa*, black) one color word here mentioned to which we can give a meaning that will answer all cases; at times applied to yellowish objects, at times to reddish, again to objects partaking of both colors, these words are as vague in meaning and as wide in application as the English use of purple in purple blood or purple grape.

*Gaura*, which is applied as adj. to milk, is used as substantive to denote a kind of buffalo, and in the frequent expression "*gauro na trṣitaḥ piba*" seems to be a general designation of cattle. Latin *galbus* has been compared with this word.

Like the use of the *kiṁçuka* tree in denoting color (v. above) is that of the *udumbara* (fig-tree) in the once found form *udumbala*, to which B. R. assign the meaning copper-colored, although its use as epithet of Yama's messenger might lead us to compare it with *çyāva*, used of Yama's steed. It is possible that the comparison is not with the leaves but with the yellow fruit. A darker red than any epithet hitherto noted is that in *kapila*, the color of the ape (*kapi*, cf. *vṛṣākapi*) used once of *garbha*. The development of a general color-term like *kapila* from the name of an animal is rather surprising, and Geiger maintains that both *gaura* and *kapila* are indicative of color first and later of names of animals. The inverted process is common enough as we have seen, and many animals are named from their color, just as they are from the sound they produce (*kāka*, *cakravāka*, *kroṣṭṛ*); nevertheless we may compare *pidāku-sānu*, *mayūra roman* (v. next paragraph) to show that the characteristics of animals are used in determining color. Dark yellow or reddish brown is the meaning assigned *kadru* (in *kadrū*) which appears only as substantive, the dark brown or dark yellow soma vessel (cf. *trikadruka*). *Babhru* is a more genuine color word than any of these. It is really the mingled color of dark red brown, but apparently darker than *piṅgala*, with which it is in Sk. frequently connected (*piṅgala* does not occur in Rik, but *piṅgā*, bow-string, is referred to *piṅga*, yellow, apparently the same as *piṅgala*).

Its use is varied, being applied to Agni, Rudra, soma, horse, cow, and the (brown) dice (nuts). It is distinguished from *aruṇa* *bradhna* and *hari*, and is used substantively to denote certain plants.

As the last word in this category we have the root *ghar*, to burn (cf. *gharma*, heat) which develops in the adj. forms into a color meaning. The idea of burn or burned is the real basis of the color idea, for this idea does not come through the meaning glance and sparkle, but is the fire color itself. The word is, however, peculiar in its application, especially in later Sanskrit, having there the meaning green as well as reddish-yellow. The first group of derivatives comprises *hari*, *harita*, *hariṇa*, the second (with stem-vowel weakened) *hiri* and *hiraṇya*. The prevailing meaning in all these words is yellow, fallow, and, in general, any change from this meaning seems to incline rather to the lighter than to the darker end of the spectrum, or, to speak more correctly, the underlying notion of burning, fiery, includes at first red and yellow, and, though use has almost confined the application to the latter, yet the former meaning is also occasionally brought into prominence. The most frequent use of the short form *hari* is in the dual as substantive to denote the two steeds of Indra (cf. *haryaṇva* of Indra), and these receive in turn epithets which show that these steeds are regarded as yellow, red, or whitish (*aruṣa*, *ṛjra*, and the once used *rohitā harī*, together with *ṣitiprṣṭha*, v. above). *Hari* is applied again to soma, which as plant or moon is yellow (though elsewhere soma is called *aruṇa*, *babhru*, *ṛjra*); cf. IX 97, 9 (*somaḥ*) *divā harir dadṛṣe naktam ṛjraḥ*—the moon looks pale-yellow in the daytime but reddish at night. To the soma itself *hari* is applied as limiting the *amṛu* (plant), *indu* (drop of the plant), and to the press stones (yellow with soma juice). Beside this frequent dual form we find singular and plural used to characterize the steeds of Agni, the sun, Savitar, the wind (*vayu*), the *Aṇvins*, and soma (moon), or the gods are conceived as steeds and receive the same epithets, or *agni*, not as god, but as fire, and *vajra*, the thunderbolt, are so called. The form *harit* (fem.) is used (like *aruṣī* and *rohit*) to denote the red or yellow mares of the sun, Agni, Indra and Soma, or the fingers spoken of metaphorically as steeds. *Haritvat*, gold-yellow, is epithet of the glory, brightness of the sun (*haritvatā varcasā*) where, if *varcas* itself means brightness, we may translate “by the glaring gleam.”

The longer form *harita*, fem. *hariṇī* (cf. *hariṇa*, gazelle, fallow-

## ZOLOGY.

ewhat wider applica-  
to the divinities and  
in the same way as  
thunderbolt, the ape  
forms of the gods, the  
d, referring to soma,  
two horns, and çiprā  
ctive to vanaspati, the  
pithet hiranyaya, the  
be assumed for harita  
ndra. Once, too, we  
wood as opposed to  
a meaning approach-  
applied apparently to  
iyūpa in hariyūpiya,  
').

ika) where we would  
han by yellow. Omit-  
is spoken of without  
an antithesis between  
hat is harita, and also  
mānam nāma)," but  
lj. virūpa, variegated,  
z is so probably by  
efore, as far as this  
of yellow or its later

rivarpas, which signi-  
ish greenish appear-  
idhāyasam, pṛthivīm  
re Ludwig translates  
sends (us) down the  
covering." And we  
appellation which we  
r "green," and such  
the rest of the hymn  
aning in this word to  
ar compounds which  
rm (harivarpas, in X

is (yellow) jaundice

(hariman) shall pass upon the parrots, Geiger seems to draw the conclusion that the (green) parrots are regarded as yellow. But the color is not spoken of as passing over to the parrots, all parrots are not green, and finally the same disease is desired for the *hāridrava*, an unknown yellow bird (from the same root with lengthened stem vowel, as in *hāriyojana* 'the harnessing of the yellow steeds'). The compounds of these words show much the same usage as the application of the simple adjectives, *harikeṣa* and *hariṣmaṣāru*, yellow-haired (of Indra, Agni, and the sun); *harijāta*, born in yellow red glance (of Indra). We have, too, some compounds where *hari* as first member means Agni, as *harivrata*, or Soma, as *harivat*, *haripā*, or the press-stones, as *haridru* and *hariṣāc*, or the thunderbolt, if *harimanyusāyaka* be correctly interpreted, or the steeds of the gods, as *hariyoga* and *hariṣṭhā*. Like the use of *harit* is that of *hari* in *hariṣipra*, and in *hariṣcandra* (cf. *hariṣrī*, mentioned in 1) we have the two roots, one of fire, one of whiteness, united (cf. *hiraṇyacandra*). From the other form, *hiri*, we have similar compounds, *hiriṣipra*, *ṣmaṣru* (of Agni and Indra), and *hirimant* (of Indra) gleaming, to which we have the corresponding form *harivant*. The form *hiri* does not occur except in composition, and that but seldom. *Hiraṇya* (Zend *Zaranya*) with its many derivatives is employed in the universal sense of the yellow-gleaming metal (gold), and since this meaning is universal we note only those compounds which may illustrate the compounds of *hari*. Thus this word is also compounded with *keṣa* (hair) to describe Agni, and *hiraṇyaya* is an adjective applied to cattle, thunderbolt, etc. So *hiraṇya-rūpa* or *hiraṇya-varṇa*, gold-color, which underlies the meaning of *hiraṇyākṣa*, golden-eyed, of Savitar, is like the use of *hari* in Rig Veda when applied to the persons of the divinities (*haryakṣa*, however, is post-Vedic and in epic, *Mbhā* X 1, 38, means yellow-green-eyed: [so'paṣyat] *ulūkam haryakṣam babhrupīṅgalam*).

§4. We come now to the second color that our forefathers are said to have "had no name for, because they could not distinguish it from black, grey and brown" (Geiger, *bd.* II, s. 356). There is but one word under discussion, *nila*, which means in classical Sanskrit dark blue. Geiger asserts that in the Rig Veda this word means only black or dark-brown, and even in the later epic he would prefer to understand grey as the meaning of the word (s 307). The Petersburg lexicon defines *nila* as dark-colored, particularly dark-blue, blue-black. Before entering on the discussion

in regard to the Rig Veda we would like to point out its exact meaning in the later literature, as the cases where the word occurs in the Rig Veda are few. On glancing over the various compounds of *nīla* found in the classical literature we see at once that the prevailing idea is dark-blue, and that the meaning "blue" is so inherent in the word that the accessory notion of *dark* easily vanishes, whereas the meaning *blue* remains, so that we may often render the word simply as blue, but never simply as black. Especially where *nīla* is introduced into languages that have no affinity with Sanskrit this prevalence of the blue is conspicuous, as, for instance, in Tamil, where to-day *nīla* is synonymous with sky, *i. e.* the blue. But even in pure Sanskrit the *nīlavarna* is blue, and in the substantive form *nīla* is synonymous with the blue-water-lily or the blue sapphire. Generally, however, the word denotes a darker blue, as in expressing the color of the snake's back, the waters of the sea, the neck of the peacock (cf. *nīlakaṇṭha*, *nīlagrīva* of *Çiva*), or the indigo (cf. Rood, *Modern Chromatics*, p. 21). The form *nīlaka* has the same meanings, though used perhaps more decidedly in the sense blue than dark-blue. The derivation of the word is unknown, for its assumed connection with Lat. *niger* (Geiger, s. 306) is at best but a guess. If we turn from the classical to the Vedic use we find first that *nīla* in the Atharva Veda is distinguished from *lohita* and from *piṅga* (red and reddish-brown) and occurs in a few compounds, of which the exact meaning is doubtful, although they *seem* to denote more the dark than the blue color, but as both these forms (*nīlaçikaṇḍa* and *nīlanakha*) are mere names of demons, the latter being distinguished from the green or yellow demons, called *harita* (19, 22, 4 and 5; *nīlanakebhyaḥ svāhāḥ*, *haritebhyaḥ svāhāḥ*) we can assign no exact meaning to the adjective (*nīlaçikaṇḍa* is like *nīlallohita* an epithet of *Çiva*). In the same way *nīlam udaram* (15, 1, 17) is opposed to the *lohitaṁ pṛṣṭham* of the anthropomorphized deity, as in *Çat. Br. çukla*, the gleaming white is distinguished from *nīla*, where, however, black is not necessarily the meaning of *nīla*.

Geiger and Weise assume that this word *nīla*, which may occasionally mean dark without reference to blue (?), but which in the majority of cases in the later literature has a distinctly blue tone, is, in the Rig Veda, entirely devoid of the meaning blue. If, now, the derivation is unknown and the word everywhere except in the Rig Veda appears to mean dark blue, and even blue alone, it will be necessary, in order to support Geiger's statement, to prove that

nila in the Rig Veda is applied in such connection that it is here impossible to attribute to the word any meaning of blue at all.

We examine then the use of nila in the Rik. The word never occurs alone, but always in composition. First as adjective with the suffix -vat, nilavant, the word is used once as epithet of drapsa. If we isolate the word from its connection we could here learn nothing of the meaning, for drapsa (literally *drop*) is elsewhere called white (çveta), black (kr̥ṣṇa), and red (aruṇa). The use is here, however, metaphorical, and drapsa means the spark of the fire, the verse in which it is contained being part of a hymn to Agni (VIII 19, 31): "Thy spark, O Agni, is nilavān, kindled in good time." Now we connect no especial idea of darkness with a spark of fire, and if we compare this passage with VII 87, 6, we find *drapsa* is used metaphorically of the moon and receives the epithet çveta, the white, the shining spark in the sky. Since in the first passage the time of lighting the fire is meant, I have thought it possible that nilavān here might betoken the blue color of the first small flames that arise when wood is kindled. Not insisting on this, however, it remains to be proved that the spark of a newly kindled fire is black or dark—yet such must be the meaning if Geiger is correct. Nilavant occurs in one other passage as epithet of sadhastham, place, home, refuge. It is, however, questionable whether the word which belongs in this passage can have any influence on the discussion at all, for if we read with Müller's large edition, nilavant, we have an entirely different word meaning nest-like (so understood by Sāyana). The former reading nilavant is, however, introduced into Müller's small edition, and is endorsed by the Petersburg lexicon. Regarding this reading as correct, we find that in the passage in which it occurs the poet is speaking of Bṛhaspati, who is said (IV 50, 4) to be arisen out of light, and (II 23, 3) to be the enemy of darkness. We are therefore inclined at the outset to be sceptical, when we are asked to believe that in this passage (VII 97, 6) the same god is represented as one whose strength is a *dark* place, nor are we more inclined to believe this when we examine the whole passage: tam aruṣāso aṇvā bṛhaspatim . . . vahanti sahaçcid yasya nilavat sadhastham nabhona rūpam aruṣam vasānāḥ, i. e. "red steeds carry this Bṛhaspati of whom the power is a place nilavat, being clothed as with a cloud in red color." In the following verse we are told of his golden weapon, and the whole picture of the god is one of bright color and glance. Why then should his strength be a place of darkness? It is not here the picture of a

god of light born from the darkness that precedes the dawn. With this idea we are familiar, but here we have *sadhasstham*, either a place of refuge for those who invoke the god, or his place, his home (as in A. V. II 2, 1, *divi te sadastham*) is itself a source of strength. In the latter case we might translate: "Bṛhaspati whose strength is the dark blue place," i. e. the sky. But however we take *sadhasstham*, what sense do we make from the passage by translating *nilavat* dark-colored?

Beside these cases *nila* is used twice (III 7, 3, V 43, 12) in composition with *prṣṭha* (back) as epithet of Agni. *Nilaprṣṭha* has been translated "he whose back is black," i. e. the fire. We are accustomed to the idea of black in connection with fire, for we have it, for instance, in the passage quoted in §3, where the path of the fire is black (*kṛṣṇa*), and such compounds as *kṛṣṇā-yāma*, *kṛṣṇa-vyathis*, *kṛṣṇa-vartani*, *kṛṣṇa-sīta*, *kṛṣṇādhvan*, give the same idea of the black path. But in all these expressions the adj. is

1 the substantive invariably means the *track* 10 in *kṛṣṇa-pavi* and in the doubtful passage (*rayaḥ*) while in *kṛṣṇagarbha* and *kṛṣṇa-yoni* which the fire comes is meant. We have, timony to the effect that the "back" of Agni ark, but as light: I 58, 2, *prṣṭham prūṣitasya* the back of the fire shines like the back (vault) could *prṣṭha* refer to the track of the fire hat *nila* is here dark, for the path of Agni is ncing, cf. *citra-yāma*, of Agni (III 2, 13). This nployed to characterize the *hamsa* (pl.), a bird as goose, crane, swan, flamingo, etc. In VII scribed as *nilaprṣṭhāḥ*. Whether *nila* here black remains an open question, but that the ecessarily mean dark without any idea of blue The *hamsa* as steed of the Aśvins receives the ired (*hiranya-parṇa*), but this is figurative. me for the Indian crane (from this same *nila* i is said to be bluish in color; and *nilākṣa* is ose from its (not dark but) blue eye (*akṣa*). as the case is, the similar usage of the later us rather to incline to the meaning blue than

cases in the Rig Veda in which *nila* occurs, ige (X 85, 28) where it is found compounded



with lohita (late form for rohita); and, as Geiger says, the passage is probably taken from the Atharva Veda, as it is identical with A. V. 14, 1, 26. Even if genuine, and if lohita were not itself a suspiciously late form, we should learn nothing from the passage of the color of nila, for reference is made to bewitchery, *kr̥tyā*, and the verse states that the color of this power is red and nila, which might be black, blue or any other color. It is from the fact that the sky is not called blue in the Rig Veda that Geiger doubts if blue was known as a color, and after examining the use of nila he draws from the above few, and, if I am not mistaken, in part contradictory data the conclusion "blue was not mentioned and was not known in the time of the Rig Veda, but develops out of the idea black or brown, the only meaning that nila can there have." The facts of the case are, however, that the *word* for dark-blue occurs in the Rig Veda, and Geiger has not proved that this customary meaning is impossible in the Vedic application of the word. Why the sky is not called blue will be discussed in Part II.

§5. Without any notion of lighter color is *çyāva* (dark-brown), employed as epithet of horse and chariot, and substantively as (brown) horse, nomen proprium, and (in the feminine form *çyāvī*) the brown mare, the night. It is contrasted with red, *rohita*, and white, *çiti*(-pad). The later post-Vedic word *çyāma* (dark green or dark blue) appears to be a related word.

Blackness, or darkness (*andhas*, *tamas*, cf. *andha* with *tamas*, and *tamīsrā*, night) is often implied by negation of light, as in *aruc*, *arājin*, *acitra* (cf. *aketu*), while black itself is denoted by the adjectives *asita* (*sita*, white, does not occur in the Rig Veda) and *kr̥ṣṇa* (*varṇa*). The latter occurs in many compounds, and the feminines *kr̥ṣṇā*, *kr̥ṣṇī* are used as substantives to denote the blackness of night or night itself. *Kr̥ṣṇa* as proper name is equivalent to *Rāma* (the dark), and its related *rātrī*, night.<sup>1</sup>

§6. It remains to say a few words in regard to some designations which come under none of the above heads: *palita*, grey, and *palasti*, said by Sāyana to be the same as *palita* (in *palastijamadagni*) means the greyness of years, as substantive (pl.) grey hairs. We have several words and expressions meaning varie-

<sup>1</sup> Night, as we have seen from many examples, may be termed either the dark or the bright, according as the dominant idea is that of gloom on earth or of light among the heavenly luminaries. In *doṣā* and *pradoṣam* (evening, darkness, opposed to *uṣas*, dawn) Grassmann sees a derivative from *duṣ*, to spot, darken.



gated, as *ṛjika*, *vi-rūpa*, *viçvarūpa*, *puru-rūpa* (cf. X 169, 2 [*gāvah*] *yāḥ sarūpāḥ virūpā ekarūpāḥ*) used especially of the cows, but also of the cloud, milk, sun, frog, snake, etc. So *prṣant* (*prṣati*) spotted (sprinkled), of the cows, the clouds, Maruts' steeds, etc. *Çabala* is used in the same way of Yama's dogs (cf. *Udumbala*) and *çarvarī* are the variegated steeds of the Maruts (cf. B. R. s. v.); so, too, *kilāsi*, properly leprous. In *mayūra-roman*, said of the steeds of Indra, we have an attempt at color-description that reminds us of *kapila* (v. above), literally the word means "peacock-haired," that is, many-colored. Like the compounds of *rūpa* is *sprhayadvarṇa* (II 10, 5) literally "striving after color," *i. e.* changing color, of Agni; but *varṇa* does not occur compounded with *vi*, *puru*, *viçva* (and is therefore a later word for color than *rūpa*?). Both *rūpa* and *varṇa* denote color, as in *sa-rūpa sa-varṇa* (of like color), *su-rūpa (vi-ṣu-rūpa) su-varṇa*, (of good color, cf. *sudṛçikarūpa*). *Vyeta* (f. *vyeni*) is strengthened from *eta* (f. *eni* and *etā*) with the same idea of many-colored, used of Uṣas. Strength of color is denoted by *vi* in composition, or by the accompanying adverb *bṛhad*, strong, as in *bṛhadbhānu*, or by *rabhasa*, as in *rabhasāna*.

The word *madhu* (sweet, honey) is compounded with *varṇa* (color), and characterizes the *ghṛta*, melted butter, Açvins, and chariot. This *madhuvarṇa* may mean, as Sāyana says, "having an agreeable color," or we may take it more literally as "honey-colored."

## PART II.

We find from this investigation that the use of color words in the Rig Veda is not unlike that in other poetic literatures. The light colors predominate in frequency of occurrence and breadth of application. All that glances, glares, sparkles, is more frequently described than that which is dark and gloomy. Light and dark are the broad general antitheses, real color is less often mentioned, and to fix any exact standard for these colors is impossible, as this is forbidden by the general meaning of the root, or by the uncertainty we are in in regard to the real color of the objects described. It is, finally, impossible to mark off distinct meanings for the majority of color words used in the Rig Veda, as no one color term is precise enough to answer to any one spectrum color; an indefiniteness that lies, however, in the language alone, since we have no proof that such indefiniteness was the result of physical

inability to distinguish between the various colors or shades of color which in the literature are grouped under one universal term. In regard to the disputed colors, we have two words, *hari* (*harita*), and *nila*, which in the later literature may mean, on the one hand, yellow and green, on the other hand dark and (dark-) blue. A few cases render it possible that the later meaning of these adjectives *may* exist in the Rig Veda; that such later meaning *cannot* exist in the Rig Veda is neither proved nor disproved. Unless *nila* include the idea of violet we have no term for this color in the Vedic literature.

We pass now to a discussion of Geiger's theory in regard to the explanation of the infrequency or, as he would say, the absence of those terms which denote green and blue. Before criticizing this theory from the standpoint of the Rig Veda, I would call the reader's attention to a few statistics on this very point drawn from much later literature.

In Milton's *Paradise Lost* we have all the light gleaming colors used in abundance, chiefly red and yellow, especially in union with lurid, dazzling, etc., whereas green is mentioned but fifteen times, only nine places show purple (which is indefinite and may mean red, of blood and roses, or blue-black, of grapes), and the test adjective, blue, is found but once (XI 206), although the lapis lazuli is occasionally made to do duty as blue in the term "azure." In the rainbow Milton sees "three listed colors" (XI 866, 897). Going back to the thirteenth century we find in the use of color words in the *Nibelungenlied* a still better proof of how fair an index of ocular development is given us by the employment or non-employment of certain colors in the literature. For here red is, as proved by the overwhelming majority of cases, the favorite color word. Yellow occurs less often, and a pure color word for yellow occurs but once, the idea being generally suggested by comparison with gold. Green is mentioned only four times, but never except in the fixed expressions "green as grass," "greener than grass" (*graz* or *klê*), applied to jewels, marble and silk, but never to fields, trees or mountains. Finally, in the 9516 verses of this poem we have not a single mention of blue, although every opportunity is presented the poet for describing sea and sky by this color.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The precise use of color words in the *Nibelungenlied* is as follows (the numbers refer to the stanzas in Bartsch's edition): The chief verbs denoting glance and shine are *liuhten* and *schînen*; glancing is denoted by *licht* (adj.)

Prof. March (in his essay before the Am. Phil. Ass. in Cambridge, July, 1882) has told us that in Beowulf (circa 7th century) no word occurs for blue or green. It may, if I am not mistaken, be added that in the Heliand, about the same time, there is no word for blue.

I now return to the Rig Veda. Weise says, quoting from Geiger the statement that fields and fruits are often spoken of while we never hear of *green* fields: 'All, at first, was vague in color, but gradually a difference was perceived, and men were compelled to find some term to express this newly observed appearance'; and again: 'green was for a long time regarded as yellow.' Geiger himself (Bd. II, s. 305) says of the period represented in the Rig

and (adv.) *lichte schīnen* (2006); as noun *licht* is candle (1005). The adj. (to which, in 80, the word *gevar* (color) is added, in *waete licht gevar*) is applied to cloth, garments (*kleit, wāt, gewant*, 572, 80, 363, 586), *pfeelle* (570, 833), *porte*, *gewūrte* (429, 573), precious stones (586, 1783), *bant* (von *golde*, 1654); weapons and armor (*helm*, 1783, 1744, 205, *helmvaz*, 2279), cf. *helmenglanz*, 1841, and *goldvaz*, 1328; *schild* (212, 2170, etc., cf. *der lichten schilde schīn*, 1602), *ringe* (214, 2218), *swerte* (233, strengthened by *vil*, 1972), *brünne* (66, 406), *wīcgewant* (2317, in 1597 *wīcg. "in herlicher varwe"*); furs, *riuhe* (954): again, used of flesh (*hende*, 587, *wange*, 618, *ougen* 84, 1286, with *vil* 1069, 1349), the red color of the face (*varwe*, 240); of gold (183, 255, 570) which is red, or of the moon (283, 817, 1620 *der lichte māne*), of the sun (1624, *lichtez schīnen*), the dawn (1360, *den lichten morgen schīnen sach*). *Licht* as adj. corresponds to the verb and noun (*schīnen, schīn*) of glance, or is united with *rôt*, red, to intensify the redness (2068, *lichtez golt vil rôt*, or 400, *schellen von lichtem golde rôt*, cf. *bouc . . . licht unde schöne was er von golde rôt*).

White, *wīz*: is used of flesh (*hant*, 274, 1011, 1358, 1701, cf. *vīl wīze hant*, 661; *arme*, 451), of dress (compared to snow, *mit snēwīzen geren*, 555, 392, compared to *saben*, in *saben wīzer hemedē*, 632, 976), of sails (*wīzer dan der snē*, 508), of silk (*sīder wīz* also *der snē*, 362), of armor (*wīze brünne*, 79, 188, *halsperge wīze*, 1717). White, *blanc*: is used of cloth (*hemedē blanc*, 670), of horse and garment both (*von snē blanken varwe*, 399), of sweat (1882).

Loss of color, paleness, is denoted by *bleich*, generally opposed to red: *varwe* (155, 1665, 1734, etc.), just as the "*lichte varwe*," in 987, is "*des tōdes zeichen*."

Red, *rôt* (occurs most often of all colors): is used chiefly to describe gold, *golt vil rôt*, *golt daz rôte* (268, 854, 951, 999, 569, 687, 1784, 4795, 1427, 1554, 2130, 68, 92, 71, 1795), and *goldesrôt* characterizes garments, saddles, horse-trappings, or goblets (*von golde rôt*, 606). Red alone is the characteristic of the *bougen* (1322, 1634, 2204), or intensified by *vil* (1550), and with *all* the *rôt* is epithet of gold (*von alrôtem golde*, 435, in 1595 *ein zeichen rôt*); or, again, *rôt* betokens the blood color (1624, 1006, *bluotes rôt*), and in 2309 (*brünne rôt*, with gold or with blood, 428, 2309), more particularly *var nach bluote* (212) is blood-colored, the same as *bluotes varwe* (218), so *rôte bāre* (239 reddened with blood), *von bluote rôt* (1011, 1932); armor is bloody red, an *sīme rôtem* (i. e.

Veda: "Not only was the sky not called blue, but nothing was called blue, and it was impossible to call anything blue . . . No word for such an idea could have existed, because the idea of blue was early and late bound up with another idea." We pass over the fact that Geiger, in mentioning VIII 19, 31 (where the sparks according to his theory are called black), fails to mention that the adj. is here applied to fire and contents himself with the remark "in this place *nīla* cannot mean bluish, but blackish" (s. 306), and concern ourselves with the theory alone. We have seen that in other literatures no great reliance can be placed on the occurrence of color words as indicating development or lack of development of color sense. But particularly is this true of the Rig Veda.

bloody) *helme* (191); so (2279) *von pluote rôt unde naz*, and (2088) *die blut varwen helde*. In 921 the blood is *bluomen rôt*, and *rôt* is the color of velvet (*samit rôt*, 705). Fire is thus characterized (*firver rôten vanken*, 186, 2053, *firver rôter wind*, from the clash of swords, 2062, 2275). Fire-red is blood in 2072 (*brünne firver rôt*, from blood). Rose-red is the blush (*rôsen rôt*, 241) or the color of the face in general (282); the blush of joy, *freuden rôt* (1497), *vor vreuden rôt* (448), *vrouden rôt* (770), or of shame (614), or of anger (465 in *zorne rôt*) is thus described; as, too, the redness of the lips (*rôsenvarwer munt*, 591). As mentioned above it is the antithesis of *bleich*, pale, as in 285, *er wart . . . vil dieke bleich unde rôt*; the alternation of each produces a mixed color (1666, *gemischet wart ir varwe, bleich unde rôt*). In 281 we have the very Vedic description: *Nu gie die minneclîche, also der morgenrôt tuot ûz den trûeben Wolken*.

Yellow: it is occasionally dubious whether red or yellow be meant when gold (golden) is introduced to express color. With *rôt* expressed, as is generally the case, gold is represented as red, otherwise "goldvarwe" and "guldin," or gold alone may betoken yellow, as in 434, 954 (though here *goldes zein* may be made of gold), or in 712, *die golt varwen zoume*; 376, *waz golt varwen gêren*; *goltvarwen schilde*, 376; or *guldin* in 570, *die guldînen scaemel*; 679, *ein guldin vingerlîn*; so the sword-hilt, *gehilze*, 1784, and 956, *guldîne tülle* (though in the three last *guldin* may mean made of gold). Once only have we a genuine color word for yellow, the same word that occurs so often in *Beowulf*: *Die sach man valevahse, i. e. (women) with yellow hair (vahs)*. The passage (1783 and) 1784 (quoted above) gives us in short compass almost all the color adj. of the poem which betoken gleaming, red, yellow, and green: *ein vil liehtez wâfen, ûz des knopfe schein. Ein vil liechter jaspes, grûener danne ein gras. Sin gehilze daz was guldin, die scheide ein porte rôt*.

Green is mentioned very rarely. Once, in the passage just quoted, *grûen* designates the jasper, greener than grass, and the same comparison is found (404): *von edelm marmelsteine grûene alsam ein gras*; so, too, the jewels glance with grass-green light against (wider) the (yellow) gold (436), cf. 577, *lûhte gegen der wât*, and 799, where the color of the face surpasses the glance of gold. Instead of grass we find clover once employed to illustrate the color

It is in fact misleading when one tells us that green things are mentioned so often and yet not called green. The natural implication is that we have the green color left out in a mass of literature filled with *descriptions* of earth's products. So, for instance, Montagu Lubbock understands Geiger (v. in his recent article in the *Fortnightly Review*). But, we ask, what are the trees and fields called? How often in the Rig Veda does the poet allude to these objects of nature and in what connection do they appear? Is the character of the work such that the omission of green and blue has really the weight that Geiger lays upon it? It will be seen, I think, if we ask how often the Rig Veda writers took the trouble

of the green silk "von Zazamanc," as opposed to that of Arabia which was "wîz also der snê," whereas the other is "grûen alsam der klê." In all these cases green is used merely in this one set expression.

The adjective blue [blâo] does not occur although the heavens are frequently mentioned, journeys are taken on the water, etc., etc. In 894 the verb zerbluwen which occurs in ptc. form zerblouen, has no reference to color, even if we admit the identity of "blue" and "blow."

Neither violet (purple) nor brown are mentioned. Black occurs a few times: pfelle (cf. 952) swârz alsam ein kol (365); clothes are said to be von rabenswarzer varwe (402), as is sabel (zobel, 1826). Harnaschvar is the black color of grime. The often mentioned moere (75, 570, etc.) are said to mean originally black horses (cf. Bartsch, note to 75) but in Nib. no trace of color is associated with the word. Mixed in color is grey, grâ, "ze kleidern grâ unde bunt" (59); so gris (1734) especially of grey hair, mit einer grîsen varwe (gemischt war sîn hâr), and gris means simply grey with age, den alt grîsen man (497); so grîse (old men) is opposed to die tumben (young) in 1798 (cf. 768 die tumben unt die wîsen). Variegated is expressed by bunt (59 and oft) or by gemâlet (1294). Color itself in Nib. is regarded as increasing, merte sich ir varwe (561); lighting up, erzunde sich (292); paling away, erblüete ir liechte varwe (240); or as simply glancing, ir varwe . . . diu lûhte ir ûz dem golde (1351). It may be bad, missevar (= pale, of men, 1590, and of ringe, 2218). In 1702 color seems to be considered as a covering (varwe, cf. Sk. varṇa, var): ein hulft von liechem pfelle ob sîner varwe lac, the covering lay over the color (cf. 439). "Falsified color" is rouge (gevelschet frouwen varwe, 1654). Both schînen and liuhten are used absolutely, or with gegen (wider) to express contrast of color. (282) lûhte vil edel stein, (1761) garments, (cf. 1663, 570, and erlûhte, 806); as adverb lûterlich is used (283). Schînen and liuhte are united in 434, lûhte mit schîne (cf. 647, lichten schildes schîn, and 399, 2348, etc.). We find also the substantive meaning of these verbs expressed by schîn or glanz (passim).

Peculiar verbs of glance are blicken (of the sword-stroke, 2077), stieben (the blows fall so rapidly on the hero daz er stieben began, 2277 cf. 2278), so lougen (457, 460, etc., cf. 1612). In 1620 we have prehen used with schînen of the moon, and in 1841 lohen of breastplate (with glanz). As an active verb appears beluhten in 1702 (der tac . . . belûhte den schilt).

to speak of nature's beauties in grass and wood and meadow (*i. e.* where *green* would be used), that these objects are rarely referred to except in a most unpoetically practical manner, where not only green but almost every other epithet that enhances the idea is generally omitted. I consider this view as worthy of notice, for Geiger's remark in regard to the "green fields" is frequently quoted, and his general essay is I believe all that has been written on the subject from a Veda standpoint. A few statistics may, however, serve to show how comparatively little ornate mention is made of these natural products anyway, and, when alluded to, how scanty a description of any kind is added.

In the first place grass (*tr̥ṇa*) is mentioned only five times in the Rig Veda, and in not one of these cases is any epithet at all applied to it. Not only are the poets silent in regard to its color; but in the same way they are silent in regard to its growth, general appearance, luxuriance, etc. It is always in such pictureless expressions as "eat grass," "burn grass," "provide grass," "lie on the grass," "bring grass and water," the bare grass without epithet. So the plants and vegetables (*virudh* and *oṣadhī*) are, although occasionally provided with epithets, almost always regarded from a practical, utilitarian standpoint. They are full of sap (*payasvat*), sweet (*madhumat*), strengthening (*ūrjasvat*), various in kind (*viçvarūpa*, this *may* mean many-colored), they have a hundred different appearances (*çatavicaakṣaṇa*). Only once is the aesthetic side touched upon, for they are *supippala*, provided with pretty (*su*) fruits, and even this is explained by B. R. as having *good* fruits, *i. e.* useful. *Babhru* (see above) is used substantively to denote certain plants. *Çāda* (a word of doubtful meaning, B. R. "grass," Grassmann "somagefäss") occurs only once and without epithet. Finally, *yava*, corn, grain (without descriptive epithet) gives us the word *yavasa* (n.), the field of grain or corn-meadow, and may be translated simply "the meadow." This word is used upwards of twenty times, but always alone by itself, and confined to use in such expressions as "rejoice as cows in the meadow," "grow fat in the meadow," "a wild beast in the meadow," "feed in the meadow," "return from the meadow," "like rain on the meadow." This is all, we are not told that the meadows are beautiful, or sunny, or shady, or pleasant, or soft, or wide, or sloping—surely then if we are not told that they are *green* it need not surprise us. Another word for field in general is *kṣetra* (the later *kedāra* is not found in Rig Veda), and here we find certain epithets attached: V 62, 7,



a field is wished for "fruitful and good" (tilvila, bhadra), again it is called pleasant (raṇva) X 33, 6: or distant (araṇa) VI 61, 14: but undesirable is the fruitless field (agavyūti) VI 47, 20. (II 31, 15, mahi kṣetram *puruṣcandram*, wide glancing, has reference not to earthly but to heavenly fields.) In all these we see that use and not beauty is in the singer's thought. The earth itself (bhūmi, kṣam, gmā prthivī, etc.) is called the immeasurable, the extended, the strength-giver, the wide, the great, the firm, etc., the four-cornered (caturbhr̥ṣṭi), and once as we have seen (cf. §3, prthivīm harivarpasam) a doubtful color word is given it. For foliage we have parṇa (n.), literally feathers (later pattra and dala do not occur) used once X 68, 10 "as trees robbed of their foliage" (once also as special tree). Often as the trees, vana, vanaspati, vanin, vṛkṣa, (taru and druma do not occur) are alluded to, we find no variety of poetical description, though vṛkṣakeṣa occurs as epithet of mountains (girayo vṛkṣakeṣāḥ), but once as soma plant vṛkṣa is termed red (aruṇa), and supalāṣa, well covered with foliage, also occurs. The boughs (vayā and ṣākhā) are spoken of as branching (dividing) and ripe, but not otherwise. They are noticed but sixteen times in the thousand hymns (and three of these allusions are in metaphor.)

We must then, I think, admit that there is another cause than that given by Geiger and Weise for the lack of certain color words. It is because those objects in nature such as woods and fields are not brought in to be embellished—are not meant to be described. It is merely that *they* may embellish an idea that they are introduced at all; they are subordinate objects to the greater purpose of the poet. For we are not reading rhapsodies over nature when we peruse the Rig Veda. The aim of the work is different—to praise the gods and increase in worldly goods, or rather, to praise the gods *in order thereby* to increase in wealth is the one aim that inspires the overwhelming majority of the hymns. Earthly objects are therefore chiefly introduced to point a song, to specify what good the singer demands in return for his hymn. Thus it happens that the objects of earth, corn, trees, fields, are, so to speak, merely hurried into the song and then drop out of it, while the poet proceeds to glorify the deity by extolling his might and beauty. And thus we come to the explanation of the second fact—the blue fails amid the descriptions of heaven. But it is not quite exact to say the description of heaven. The vault of heaven (divos) nākaḥ-, nākasya pr̥sthā, is spoken of only about once in every forty

hymns, and then accompanied by no color word at all. Heaven's vault is not called blue, but it is also not called yellow or red, the only epithet given it that suggests color is in citraçocis, clear-shining, and agrbhitaçocis, of inconceivable brightness; beside these the only other epithets of any sort applied to it are wide (X 113, 4), lofty, mighty (VII 86, 1, and VII 99, 2). This firmament is not addressed as a deity, it is simply a locality, and is therefore merely introduced as an incident; he mounted in the vault of heaven, he stands therein, he upholds it, he adorned it with stars (I 68, 5) (cf. X 68 11), etc. The cosmology of the Hindus placed between this vault and the earth the real often-named three-fold sky—the div, dyauh. This heaven is, however, in itself color, “the glancing”; it is light. But the firmament (nāka) is not dark though it lies beyond the region of light. According to the development theory the blue vault should be dark, but in I 19, 6 we find nākasya rocane. We cannot, however, regard this as a mere confusion of firmament and realm of light, for these are carefully distinguished (cf. Zimmer Altindisch. Lebens. 358). One has to climb above dyauh to reach the divo nāka (A. V. 4, 14, 3) (cf. R. V. VI 8, 2, I 34, 8) which is supported like a pillar (IV 13, 5) and has a (rounded) back, nākasya prṣṭham (I 125, 5, cf. III 2, 12) or nākasya sānu (VIII 103, 2). Dyauh, svar, vyoman, rajas (antarikṣam), give the theatre for the color-display of the clouds and storms. If we understand the meteorological notions of the Veda we shall not be able to say that the blue heaven is often described but never called blue. The blue heaven, *i. e.* firmament, is not “*often described*,” it is scarcely *described* at all, and stands above the realm of which the Vedic poets give us their glowing accounts, outside the stage on which the wonders of heaven are enacted. That which is described is the lower heaven, not the blue firmament—where, had we the same views in regard to the heavens, we also should find no occasion to speak of blue. The mass of color description, as of all other description, falls where the whole interest of the poets lies, upon the active powers of the atmosphere and the lower sky. These were the subject of their hymns, and to describe these powers was to glorify and to worship them. It was not the blue firmament with which the Vedic singers were impressed, their deities do not live there, and therefore, as the whole object of the hymns is bound up in the gods, it is easy to see why this firmament was so seldom alluded to as compared to the innumerable descriptions of the (lower, not blue but shining) atmospheric sky. Here is the real



abode of their divinities. It is, therefore, not strange that, being so seldom alluded to, *nāka* has no real epithet of color given it, while we find the colors which appertain to the lower heaven, the home of the gods, are often employed by the poets. This lower heaven is not only the home of the gods, it is a god itself, *dyos pitā*, whereas the *nāka*, firmament which is blue, is not conceived as divinity. The gods whose praises the poet sings are red and yellow, white or dark, the colors of sunrise and lightning, of the morning clouds and the gleam of the sun. The Vedic singer occupies himself with the foreground, he was too busy with the prominent features and characters of the scene to care much for the background, of his picture. Beautiful things *per se* he did not celebrate, for beauty was an incident of his song, not the theme. So, too, on earth, beauty of color did not often appeal to the unaesthetic mind of the Vedic poet. And then, for instance, we find when the lotus is mentioned, it is more as something worthy of notice for its beauty of smell than for its beautiful color, and amid all the luxuriant vegetation of India we have only some half dozen plants mentioned by name (v. Zimmer, *Altind. Leb.* s. 71). The singer gave them no adjectives, for only to mention them was, so to speak, an adjective to his train of thought, and hence all his adjectives of description are meagre, except where they apply to the persons of the gods, or clouds, or the particular object longed for by the poet.<sup>1</sup>

There is a second point that is involved in the quotations given above from Geiger and Weise. It is in regard to the lack of clearness, the inexactness of many Vedic color terms. From this, however, we cannot draw the conclusion that the sense of color was inexact, for we could scarcely affirm this if it were proved to exist in the language used. There is, however, no literature where color words are applied to objects which are so constantly indefinite in point of color. The gods, the natural forces of the atmosphere, the clouds, the steeds of the gods, horses, wolves, cows—these are the objects of which color is chiefly predicated. The application of color words is made in most cases where we ourselves would be

<sup>1</sup> Even as late as the second century B. C. we find an analysis of light that gives only three colors and excludes green: *Anugīta*, *Mbh.* XIII 50, 46 (cf. XII 184, 35) *jyotiṣaṣca guno rūpam, rūpam ca bahudhā smrtam* (the quality of light is color which is manifold), and these colors are given as (black, white) red, yellow and blue. Yet in the *Rig Veda* (X 55, 3) light is declared to consist of thirty-four different parts: *catuṣtrimṣitā purudhā vicaṣṭe sarūpeṇa jyotiṣā vivratena*.

at a loss to say what exact term might best describe the object. If we found that a word which means yellow alone is applied to something which is and can be only red or green, then we might admit a confusion of epithets and of idea. But such cases do not occur. It is, again, impossible to say at what period the idea of the root that underlies the color word has passed into abeyance and left a fixed color term. Green and yellow may both at the same time be denoted by the burn-color hari with the subsidiary notion of fiery or shining. The conception is not indefinite because the appearance is described by a general term. "Blue," to our minds, embraces many colors, but the one name covers all shades. We cannot say that yellow preceded green in the Teutonic languages though *gêlu* and *gruoni* come together from this same root *ghar*. Nor can we say at what time the "glare" (*ghar*) in *gêlu* ceased to be prominent.

We conclude, then, by affirming: 1st, Non-mention of the colors green and blue is not proved for the Rig Veda literature; 2d, That the sky is not called blue nor the fields green rests on reasons which have nothing to do with the development of the retina; 3d, We cannot admit that either color words or color perception of those who composed the Rig Veda were inexact or imperfect, for the cause of the apparently inexact employment of words lies in the variable and uncertain color of the objects to which the color terms are applied.

The theory of the development of the color sense rests, from a literary point of view, in great part on negative data. From the standpoint of physiology it has no support. Lubbock has shown that savages have perfect sense of color, Wallace has affirmed that non-mention of color is in general no proof that it was not appreciated. We have endeavored to show that this is true at all times and to explain the reasons for this fact in the Rig Veda.

If the Vedic literature fail to support the theory, one of the strongest of these negative proofs is withdrawn, and even the absence of certain colors in Homer may be deemed perhaps of less significance than has been claimed when we consider that the *Nibelungenlied* exhibits, twenty centuries later, the same absence of corresponding colors, and a like ratio in the greater use of terms denoting red and yellow.

EDWARD W. HOPKINS.

## IV.—THE HARBORS OF ANCIENT ATHENS.

### I.

It is not necessary to enumerate here the various positions which have been assigned, during the last fifty years, to the different harbors of ancient Athens. It is sufficient to say that, in the early part of the century, the easternmost natural haven (Phanari) of the Peiraic peninsula was identified as the port of Phaleron. Later, the investigations of several distinguished German scholars, especially of Ulrichs and Curtius, led them to place Phaleron at the eastern extremity of the bay of the same name, near the spot now known as Haghios Georgios. This theory is now generally accepted; and the port of Phanari is known as Mounychia, and the southeastern harbor of the peninsula (Pasha-Limani)<sup>1</sup> as Zea. There has been no dispute about the identity of the main harbor of the Peiraieus, which has now resumed its classic name; but the subdivision of this harbor, attempted in accordance with ancient texts, is a matter of much uncertainty.

### II.—PHALERON.

“In the maritime towns of antiquity, the seaport was frequently separate from the city proper, and at some distance from it. In early times there were very few artificial harbors, surrounded by quays, divided into basins, and protected by jetties, breakwaters, and fortifications, as in many modern seaports. . . . The ancients chose as a rule, for their ports, a small natural gulf or inlet, sheltered from the fury of the open sea, and provided with a gently inclined beach, upon which their vessels could be drawn up.”<sup>2</sup> An examination of the conformation of the Athenian coast renders it doubtful whether these conditions are fulfilled in the site ascribed to Phaleron at Haghios Georgios. This site is described as follows by M. Émile Burnouf, ex-Director of the French School at Athens: “It would be impossible to establish a harbor near Τρεῖς Πύργοι, except

<sup>1</sup> Stratiotiki—(Leake).

<sup>2</sup> Charles Lenthéric—*La Provence Maritime Ancienne et Moderne*. Paris, 1880, p. 209.

by the construction of breakwaters of great extent ; and even such breakwaters would afford incomplete protection against winds from the west and south. There remains no vestige of a breakwater, or of engineering works of any kind ; while the cape at the extremity of the bay would afford but scant shelter to a single fishing boat."<sup>1</sup>

In the harbor of Phanari, on the other hand, at the western end of the Phaleric bay, we have a beautiful little natural basin, almost circular, and about one-fifth of a mile in diameter. This basin has a single narrow entrance, contracted still further by ancient Hellenic breakwaters, which remain almost perfect. The harbor is sheltered on three sides from the wind, and it possesses the sandy beach which was sought by the ancients for their ports. At the water's edge are remains of numerous shipways and houses, both cut in the rock and constructed of blocks of hewn stone. Even taking into consideration that, before the Persian war, the naval power of Athens was comparatively inconsiderable, and that the ships were small and drawn easily up on the shore, it would seem reasonable that so excellent a natural harbor should be chosen in preference to the open coast near Haghios Georgios, exposed to storms and difficult to defend against a hostile surprise. It must be conceded that Haghios Georgios is considerably nearer Athens than Phanari ; but we shall see below that the distance of the latter place from the city accords better than that of the former with the length of the Phaleric Long Wall as given by Thucydides.<sup>2</sup>

### III.

I will not repeat the arguments of Ulrichs and Curtius in favor of the identification of Haghios Georgios with the ancient Phaleron. These arguments are reviewed and summed up very clearly in Curt von Wachsmuth's *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*,<sup>3</sup> a work of much erudition, in which is brought together a mass of ancient information with reference to each question discussed. I will now consider some points in the scanty ancient testimony that remains to us regarding the topography of the Athenian seaports, which seem to throw doubt upon the solution generally accepted.

The Long Walls to Phaleron and the Peiraieus were begun in 459 B. C.<sup>4</sup> If Phaleron was at Haghios Georgios, nearly two miles of

<sup>1</sup> *La Ville et l'Acropole d'Athènes*. Paris, 1877, p. 136.

<sup>2</sup> Book II, chapt. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Leipzig, 1874, p. 306 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Thucydides, I 107.

shore along a plain, in some places indeed marshy, but in general smooth and accessible, lay exposed to a hostile attack from the sea between the Long Walls,<sup>1</sup> of which the usefulness was thus seriously impaired. It is true that Athens had, at the time of the construction of the Long Walls, almost reached the zenith of her power both by sea and by land. However, it would not be safe to assume that she could consider herself secure against even a raid from the sea. An old rival and bitter enemy—Aigina, the “eyesore of the Peiræus”—lay only a few miles distant across the Saronic gulf, her temple of Athena in plain sight from Athens three miles inland. Aigina was indeed much crippled, but she still retained some semblance of independence.<sup>2</sup> It was not until 455,<sup>3</sup> four years after the Long Walls were begun, that she was forced to surrender her last ships to Athens. Many of the allies of Athens had considerable naval power until long after this. It was thirty years later that Lesbos revolted and was crushed; and the presiding city of the confederacy had before her the example of the revolt of Thasos,<sup>4</sup> to warn her against over-confidence in the fidelity of her allies. Yet the Outer and the Phaleric Long Walls were begun some eighteen years after the Peiræus had become her principal seaport; and there was therefore no urgent necessity for seeking to assure the connection between the metropolis and Phaleron; while the attempt to do so in the way that Thucydides tells us it was done, always granting that Phaleron was at Haghios Georgios, would have introduced an obvious element of weakness into the whole system of fortification.

The following is the main passage of Thucydides which bears upon the defences of Athens and her ports at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war: “The length of the Phaleric Long Wall was thirty-five stadia, to the fortifications of the city. The circuit of that portion of the fortifications of the city which was kept under guard was forty-three stadia, in addition to the portion left unguarded, between the [outer] Long Wall and the Phaleric Wall. The length of the Long Walls to the Peiræus was forty stadia; and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wachsmuth—*Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*, p. 558.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. von Alten, in the *Erläuternder Text of Curtius and Kaupert's Karten von Attika*, Berlin, 1881. Heft I, p. 10, “Die Nähe des feindlichen Aegina, von welchem man jeder Stunde eines Ueberfalls gewärtig sein konnte, allein machte eine solche Sicherung [the fortification of the seaports] nöthig.”

<sup>3</sup> George W. Cox—*The Athenian Empire* (Epoch series). London, 1876, p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> 465–463 B. C.

of these the outer one was guarded. The whole circuit of the Peiraieus, including Mounychia, was sixty stadia, of which the half was guarded.”<sup>1</sup>

Even if we allow that the entire land side of the Peiraic peninsula, including the circuit of the promontory of Eëtioneia, was held under guard without reference to the Long Walls to Athens—a condition which is highly improbable—we must fill out from the sea-walls of the peninsula a large part of Thucydides’ thirty stadia. The inference is easy, that at the beginning of the war, although an attack from the sea may not have been much dreaded, still it was thought necessary to take proper precautions.<sup>2</sup> Yet, according to the accepted theory concerning the harbors, we must believe that a long stretch of sandy beach was left unprotected between the Peiraic peninsula and Phaleron. We know that the middle Long Wall was not guarded, and that there was a portion of the city wall, “between the Long Wall and the Phaleric Wall,” which was not occupied by the garrison. We must imagine, therefore, about three square miles of land, in great part fertile, of which the value to Athens would have been inestimable, during the Peloponnesian invasions, exposed to a bold nocturnal raid at the hands of such enemies as the Lacedaemonians. Worse than this, the middle Long Wall might have been seized, or even an entrance to the city have been gained by surprise over the undefended section of the fortifications.

An argument perhaps still more forcible against the existence of this great intervening space between Phaleron and the Peiraieus is found in Thucydides’ description of the crowded state of the city at the time of the first Peloponnesian invasion. Thucydides’ words are as follows: “When the country people arrived in Athens, some few of them found lodgings in the houses of friends or relatives; but the great majority established themselves in the open spaces of the city, and in all the sacred enclosures of gods and heroes, except the Akropolis and the Eleusinion, and some other places which were kept resolutely closed.”<sup>3</sup> Even the spot beneath the Akropolis, called the Pelasgikon, was thus occupied, in spite of curses which had been proclaimed against its settlement,

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides, II 13, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Later, the Athenians became more careless in their watch toward the sea, as we know by the amusing incident of the planned Spartan attack upon the Peiraieus, described by Thucydides, Book II, 93.

<sup>3</sup> Καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο βεβαίως κληστόν ἦν.

and of the words of the Pythic oracle, 'It is better that the Pelasgikon should remain fallow.' I think, for my part, that this oracle meant the opposite of its popular interpretation, and that it was not on account of the impiety of inhabiting the Pelasgikon that disasters befell the city, but on account of the war that it became necessary to occupy the Pelasgikon. The oracle was doubtless rendered with knowledge that this place would never be given over to dwellings in time of prosperity, although it does not state this plainly. Many of the newcomers constructed quarters for themselves in the towers of the city walls, and wherever else any one was able to find accommodation; for there was not room enough in the city for so large a number as were crowded into it. Finally, they took possession of [the space between] the Long Walls, and of the greater part of the Peiraieus."<sup>1</sup>

If three square miles of ground had been available, between the Long Walls and the Phaleric Wall, it would hardly have been possible for the want of room to be so pressing. That this space could not have been left unoccupied for fear of attack is shown by the fact already often alluded to, that the middle Long Wall and a certain portion of the city wall were left unguarded. The Phaleric deme, as Strabo tells us, began at the boundary of the Peiraic, and extended along the adjacent shore.<sup>2</sup> Yet no mention is found of the occupation by the refugees of the territory of this deme, which would have been, in great part, within the walls.

Another argument against the identification of Haghios Georgios with Phaleron is furnished by the very nearness of this point to Athens. The intervening distance is only about thirty Attic stadia;<sup>3</sup> while that to the city from the little promontory on the northern side of Phanari agrees much more closely with the length of thirty-five stadia assigned by Thucydides to the Phaleric Wall. To explain away this and other difficulties in the measurements given by Thucydides, Curtius supposes that the historian used a stadion measure smaller than the usual Attic; and other scholars suppose inexactitude on the part of Thucydides, or excessive windings of the walls. The latter supposition is very unlikely in the case of fortifications of the nature of the Long Walls, upon such ground

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides, II 17; cf. II 52.

<sup>2</sup> Strabo, 39S, 21: Μετὰ δὲ τὸν Πειραιᾶ Φαληρεῖς δῆμος ἐν τῇ ἐφεξῆς παραλίᾳ . . .

<sup>3</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 330.



as this part of the Attic plain, and the first two seem disproved by independent evidence.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV.—MOUNYCHIA.

Mounychia, the Akropolis<sup>2</sup> of the Peiraieus, is identified by the German scholars with the steep hill above the harbor of Phanari. There seem to be weighty reasons for doubting the correctness of this assumption. The smaller peninsula, which forms the southern extremity of the Peiraic peninsula, is, there can be no doubt, the Ἀκτὴ of the ancients;<sup>3</sup> famed for its quarries of building stone, abundant remains of which still exist. In Herodotos, VIII 77, we have preserved the following words of an oracle:<sup>4</sup> “When they shall make a bridge with their ships between the sacred headland (ἀκτὴν) of Artemis of the golden sword and sea-girt Kynosoura, etc.” But Pausanias tells us that “the Athenians have still another harbor, that at Mounychia [where there is] a temple of the Mounychian Artemis.”<sup>5</sup> As no other Artemis is mentioned in connection with the seaports, except the Thracian Bendis, whose sanctuary was in the neighborhood of that of Artemis Mounychia,<sup>6</sup> this is enough to establish a presumption that Ἀκτὴ and Mounychia were merely different names for the same locality. This presumption is strengthened by Herodotos’ account of the disposition of the Persian fleet before the battle of Salamis: “Those who were stationed near Keos and Kynosoura brought up their ships and

<sup>1</sup> See Wachsmuth, pp. 330 and 334, etc., for this evidence. Milchhoefer says, in the explanatory text of the Karten von Attika, 1881, Heft I, p. 24, §6, that the Phaleric bay extended probably, in ancient times, much further inland towards the city; and that even now it is impossible to walk dryshod in a straight line from Athens to the site at Τρεῖς Ἱεργοί (Haghios Georgios). The sea at the eastern side of the bay is shallow and even obstructed by reefs, so as to be ill-fitted for navigation. Towards the western side of the bay, remains of ancient houses exist; these must have been in the deme of Phaleron. Milchhoefer (*loc. cit.*) seems inclined to the opinion that the port of Phaleron occupied a position now wholly inland, upon the supposed ancient inland extremity of the Phaleric bay, and not far distant from the southern Long Wall. It is probable, however, that this inlet was already, in the earliest historic times, extremely shallow.

<sup>2</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 307.

<sup>3</sup> See Wachsmuth, p. 316 *et seq.*, for proof of this.

<sup>4</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 317, and note 6.

<sup>5</sup> Pausanias, I 1, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Xenophon—Hellenica, II 4, 11. Cf. Plato—Πολιτεία, α<sup>1</sup>, I.



blockaded the whole strait as far as Mounychia. This movement was made in order to cut off the retreat of the Hellenes, . . ."<sup>1</sup>

A glance at the map shows that it is unlikely that the blockading line was extended further than the extremity of the Peiraic peninsula. If the line of ships had been carried beyond Ἀκτὴ to the Phanari harbor, a large number of ships would have been in such a position as to be unable to render any service—the whole Peiraic headland being necessarily between these ships and the scene of battle.

Under the word Μουνυχία<sup>2</sup> we find in Photios the following explanation: Ἡρώδης τινας καθιερώσαντος αὐτὴν (Μουνυχίαν Ἀρτέμιδα) ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀκρωτηρίῳ.<sup>3</sup> Wachsmuth quotes this sentence as evidence that Mounychia was the Akropolis of the Peiraieus. The word ἀκρωτηρίον describes excellently the peninsula of Ἀκτὴ, which, too, was peculiarly fitted to be the Akropolis; not only by nature, since it is connected with the main peninsula merely by a narrow isthmus, and since it commands completely the entrances both to the main Peiraieus harbor and to the harbor of Pasha-Limani, but also by art;<sup>4</sup> for considerable remains of its ancient fortifications survive. The hill above Phanari, called Mounychia by the Germans, is higher and steeper; but before the invention of gunpowder, Ἀκτὴ was plainly a more advantageous site for the Akropolis. Strabo's description of Mounychia runs as follows: Λόφος δ' ἐστὶν ἡ Μουνυχία, χερρονησιάζων καὶ κοῖλος καὶ ὑπόνομος<sup>5</sup> πολὺ μέρος φύσει τε καὶ ἐπίτηδες ὥστ' αἰκήσεις δέχεσθαι, στομίῳ δὲ μικρῷ<sup>6</sup> τὴν εἴσοδον ἔχων· ὑποπίπτουσι δ' αὐτῷ λιμένες τρεῖς. Τὸ μὲν οὖν παλαιὸν ἐτετεῖχιστο καὶ συνέκτιστο ἡ Μουνυχία παραπλησίως ὥσπερ ἡ τῶν Ῥοδίων πόλις, προσειληφυῖα τῷ περιβάλλει τὸν τε Πειραιᾶ καὶ τοὺς λιμένας πλήρεις νεωρίων, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ ὀπλοθήκη, Φίλωνος ἔργον· ἀξίων τε ἦν καύσταθμον ταῖς τετρακοσίαις ναυσίν, ὧν οὐκ ἐλάττους ἔστελλον Ἀθηναῖοι.

<sup>1</sup> Herodotos, VIII 76.

<sup>2</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 6.

<sup>3</sup> The use of the word ἀκρωτηρίον with reference to this very Ἀκτὴ, or to a hill near it, is also found in Plutarch, Themistokles, frg. 1, of Müller: Frg. Hist. Graec. II, p. 100. (Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 4.)

<sup>4</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 315, note 4. Diodoros, XX 45, and XIV 33.

<sup>5</sup> Prominent scholars consider that the expression κοῖλος καὶ ὑπόνομος applies to the peculiar aptness to the hill nearest the mainland, on account of the easy and safe passage hewn from the rock in very ancient times, and consisting of steps which descends to a great depth in the southwest side of the hill. This explanation seems, however, rather far-fetched. This passage has not yet been thoroughly investigated.

<sup>6</sup> The word μικρῷ applies very well to the narrow peninsula by which Ἀκτὴ is separated from the rest of the Peiraic peninsula.

Τῷ δὲ τείχει τούτῳ συνῆπτε τὰ καθειλκυσμένα ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος σκέλη· ταῦτα δ' ἦν μακρὰ τείχη, τετταράκοντα σταδίων τὸ μῆκος, συνάπτοντα τὸ ἄστυ τῷ Πειραιεῖ . . .<sup>1</sup>

The word *χερρονησιάζων*—forming a peninsula—seems to adapt itself admirably to Ἀκτὴ, while it cannot without a stretch of meaning be applied to the hill above Phanari. Ἀκτὴ, again, and the neck of land by which it is connected with the rest of the peninsula, are much better “adapted for dwellings,” and for the wide streets and symmetrical plan of Hippodamos—resembling those of Rhodes in beauty<sup>2</sup>—than the steep, rough slopes of the Phanari hill. The rest of the description appears to suit equally well either site.

Wachsmuth mentions<sup>3</sup> the remains of a Doric temple found upon the shore of the Pasha-Limani by Colonel Leake, and says that “Leake attributed these ruins incorrectly to the temple of Artemis Mounychia.” He gives, however, no reason why they should not belong to the temple in question as well as to any other. Again, Wachsmuth thinks<sup>4</sup> that only one theatre can have existed, in ancient times, in the seaport city. As considerable remains of a theatre survive upon the northwestern slope of the Phanari hill, and as Thucydides mentions τὸ πρὸς τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ Διονυσιακὸν θέατρον,<sup>5</sup> he argues that the Phanari hill must be Mounychia. This argument is upset by the discovery in 1880 of another theatre at the northeastern extremity of Ἀκτὴ,<sup>6</sup> close to the bay of Zea (Pasha-Limani), which it overlooks. If, therefore, Pasha-Limani is the ancient haven of Mounychia, we have in this new theatre τὸ πρὸς τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ θέατρον.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, IX 395, 15. Ed. Didot, 1853, p. 339. <sup>2</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 319.

<sup>3</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 328.

<sup>4</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 3.

<sup>5</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 2. Thucydides, VIII 93, 1. Cf. Lysias, XIII 32 and 35.

<sup>6</sup> See Karten von Attika, mit erläuterndem Text, herausgegeben von E. Curtius und J. A. Kaupert. Berlin, 1881. Heft I, Bl. II.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Dragatsis, in his article on Τὰ θέατρα τοῦ Πειραιῶς καὶ ὁ Κωφὸς λιμὴν, published in the *Παρνασσός* for 1882, p. 257 *et seq.*, gives satisfactory evidence that both theatres existed before the Peloponnesian war. He proceeds with an attempt to show from a study of Xenophon's account of the campaign of Pausanias against Thrasyboulos, that the Κωφὸς λιμὴν was not, as is usually accepted, either the inlet west of Eëtioneia or the marshy bay, now in great part filled up, at the northern extremity of the Peiraic harbor; but that it was the first of the subdivisions of the main harbor near its entrance. Even in connection with the usual theory of Peiraic topography, this part of M. Dragatsis' essay can hardly be considered successful; while if Thrasyboulos' headquarters were on Ἀκτὴ, the Spartan commander's scouting expedition towards Eëtioneia would explain itself.

## V.—THE PEIRAIEUS.

We read in Pausanias that "before Themistokles came into office . . . the Peiraieus was not the port of Athens, but Phaleron, where the sea is [comparatively] very near the city . . . But when Themistokles became prominent in the government, seeing that the Peiraieus was better adapted to the needs of navigation than Phaleron, and that it had three havens while Phaleron had but one, he took the necessary steps to create this seaport for the Athenians. And down to my own time, ship-houses have existed there; and the tomb of Themistokles is situated near the largest haven . . .

"The Athenians have still another harbor—that at Mounychia, where is the temple of Artemis Mounychia—besides the port of Phaleron, which I have mentioned already. Near the Phaleric harbor stand the temples of Demeter and of Athena of Skiras, beyond which is that of Zeus. Here, too, are the altars of the so-called Unknown Gods, etc.

". . . Twenty stadia distant [from Phaleron] is the promontory of Kolias,<sup>1</sup> upon which the current cast up the wreckage after the destruction of the fleet of the Medes [at Salamis] . . ."

Ἐχει δὲ ὁ Πειραιεὺς λιμένας τρεῖς, πάντας κλειστούς· εἰς μὲν ἐστὶν ὁ Κανθάρου λιμὴν καλούμενος, ἐν ᾧ τὰ νεώρια ἐξήκοντα, εἴτα [τὸ] Ἀφροδίσιον, εἴτα κύκλῳ τοῦ λιμένος στοαὶ πέντε.<sup>2</sup>

Ζέα . . . εἰς τῶν ἐν Πειραιεὶ λιμένων.<sup>3</sup>

Graser is of opinion<sup>4</sup> that by "the three harbors of the Peiraieus" are meant the three divisions of the main harbor formed by two projections of its shore-line. He thinks that these three havens were described as *κλειστούς*, because the fortifications at the entrance defended at once all the inner subdivisions of the harbor. This opinion is shared by Colonel Leake and by M. Burnouf, among other scholars of high standing. The adjective *κλειστούς* could refer equally well to the fact that these inner harbors were protected—"closed"—from the violence of the sea.

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias, I 1, 5. This distance corresponds very closely with that from Phanari to the promontory at the eastern extremity of the Phaleric bay.

<sup>2</sup> Pausanias, I 1, 2, 4, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Frg. 4 in Müller's Frg. Hist. Graec. IV, p. 450. (Wachsmuth, p. 310.)

<sup>4</sup> Hesychios, at the word Ζέα. (Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 5.) For other authorities mentioning the three harbors of the Peiraieus, see Wachsmuth, Part II, pp. 306–28 *passim*.

<sup>5</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 311.

The most important point in the passage from Pausanias is that, after speaking of Phaleron and the Peiraieus, with its three harbors, he mentions Mounychia as *another* harbor, implying that it was not one of the three havens of the Peiraieus proper. This militates against the modern theory that the three havens in question are the Peiraieus, Pasha-Limani, and Phanari, and that the two last are the old Zea and Mounychia. We know that Mounychia was on the Peiraic peninsula; if, then, its harbor was not one of the *λιμένας τρεῖς αὐτοφυεῖς*,<sup>1</sup> the three havens in question must have been subdivisions of the main harbor.

## VI.

From all that has preceded I venture to infer that the topographical arrangement of the chief harbors of Athens set forth last by M. Burnouf,<sup>2</sup> but not defended in detail by him, and agreeing in the main with that of Colonel Leake, is not only a possible, but even the probable arrangement. According to this theory the small peninsula at the extremity of the Peiraic peninsula is Mounychia or Ἀκτὴ; and the port beneath it to the northeast is ὁ ἐπὶ Μουνυχίᾳ λιμήν. Phanari is the ancient Phaleron, and the hill above it is the Akropolis of Phaleron.

It still remains to settle the relative positions of the three bays of the main Peiraieus harbor—Zea, Aphrodision, and Kantharos. Different students have proposed in turn every arrangement of the names rendered possible by the existing number of bays; but no one of these arrangements seems based upon conclusive evidence. The chief naval establishment was on the harbor of Zea; we have therefore some reason to identify as Zea the largest of the three interior bays—the first on the right hand side, upon entering the harbor. This position, commanding the narrow entrance and protected itself by the Akropolis of Ἀκτὴ, would have been especially favorable for the naval station; and the opinion that it was here is supported by the discovery near the modern Custom House, which stands on the point between this bay and the Πορθμεῖα or commercial port, of the important naval inscriptions first published by Boeckh. In these inscriptions reference is frequently made to “the Arsenal”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides, I 93, 3. (Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 2.)

<sup>2</sup> Émile Burnouf—La Ville et l'Acropole d'Athènes. Paris, 1877. Plate XI, and p. 136 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> See A. N. Meletopoulos—Ἀνέκδοτος Ἐπιγραφή. ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1882, p. 6, for quotations from the inscriptions.

in such terms as to leave little doubt that the arsenal in question was the famous Arsenal of Philon, which, as appears from the long inscription relating to it found last year near the Pasha-Limani (Mounychia)—as I believe, at some distance from its original position—stood “in Zea.” I think it therefore probable that this first bay is the ancient Zea, and that the great arsenal stood near it, perhaps, as suggested by Milchhoefer,<sup>1</sup> on the ridge between it and Mounychia, which was the second in importance of the old Athenian naval stations. It may be remarked that these positions for the naval stations and for the Akropolis would have been especially convenient for the transportation to the Akropolis and to the arsenal of the spars and rigging, etc., of which there is frequent mention in the naval inscriptions.

#### VII.—THE LONG WALLS.<sup>2</sup>

I have touched already upon the question of the length of the Long Walls to Phaleron and to the Peiraieus. I will give one other passage which, with that quoted already from Thucydides,<sup>3</sup> establishes clearly that there were three Long Walls—two from Athens to the Peiraieus, and one to Phaleron: “Antiphon [says] to Nikokles that there were three walls in Attika, as Aristophanes tells us in the *Τριφάλης*—the Northern, the Southern, and the Phaleric Walls. The wall which ran between the other two was called the Southern Wall; it is mentioned by Plato, also, in his *Gorgias*.”<sup>4</sup>

In connection with this τὸ διὰ μέσου τεῖχος, we meet with a difficulty. The Scholiast on Plato's *Gorgias* tells us that: διὰ μέσου τεῖχος λέγει δ καὶ ἄχρι νῦν ἔστιν ἐν Ἑλλάδι. Ἐν τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ γὰρ ἐποίησεν καὶ τὸ μέσον τεῖχος, τὸ μὲν βάλλον ἐπὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ Φάληρα.<sup>5</sup>

A possible explanation suggests itself from the topography of the ground, *i. e.* that the middle Long Wall was carried along the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Karten von Attika, 1881, Blatt IIa, and explanatory text, p. 48. Drums of Peiraic limestone and a Doric capital of Pentelic marble have been found upon this site. The dimensions of the drums correspond very well with those given in the new inscription for those of the Arsenal; the capital is a few inches higher than it should be, but possibly the specifications of the contract as to measurements were not adhered to rigidly.—See American Journal of Philology, No. 11, October 1882, p. 317 & seq.

<sup>2</sup> See Wachsmuth, Part II, pp. 325-30.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, II 13. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Harpokrates (Suidas) at the words διὰ μέσου τεῖχος. (Wachsmuth, p. 328, note 2.)

<sup>5</sup> Scholiast upon Plato's *Gorgias*, p. 304, Herm. (Wachsmuth, p. 328, note 2.)

crest of the steep hill above Phaleron, and down to the little point at the northern side of the entrance to the port of Mounychia, forming thus a dividing wall between Phaleron and the rest of the Peiraic peninsula.<sup>1</sup> This course would give to the Middle Wall approximately the length of forty stadia assigned to it by Thucydides, while other courses suggested heretofore make it fall short of this measurement. To arrive at definite results, and to settle, perhaps, this whole question of the harbors and of the Long Walls, it will be necessary to institute a thorough investigation on the spot.

The construction of the Middle Long Wall by Perikles, although the Phaleric and the Peiraic Long Walls existed already so near together, can be accounted for as a measure of extra precaution, to ensure communication with the sea if one or the other of the ports should chance to fall into the hands of an enemy, or one of the exterior walls to be carried by storm.

The German scholars do not claim to have found any vestige of a Long Wall between the shore near Haghios Georgios and Athens. They mention only some scanty ancient remains close to the sea.<sup>2</sup> These may well mark the site of an ancient settlement; my contention is merely that, for the reasons enumerated, this settlement, if it ever existed, cannot have been the port of Phaleron—the earliest seaport of Athens of which we have historic record. Burnouf, on the other hand, says: “The line given by the German scholars for a Long Wall from the cape near Treis Pyrgoi to Athens is entirely imaginary. In the whole intervening space there exists no vestige or trace of such a wall.”<sup>3</sup>

THOMAS W. LUDLOW.

<sup>1</sup> An ancient boundary monument of a public space before a gate was found in its original position on November 27, 1882, on the southern side of the hill in question, just within the exterior fortifications. I have no map sufficiently detailed to show its exact position; but from the description, the monument may very possibly refer to a fortification wall between the Peiraieus and the eastern haven. The inscription, which is prior to the IVth century, is as follows:

(Γ)ΡΟΥΤΑ  
ΟΔΕΜΟΣ(:)  
ΟΗΟΡΟΣ

(π)ροπύλ  
ου δημοσ(ι)  
ου ὄρος.

Παρνασσός, Nov. 30–12, 1882, p. 862.)

<sup>2</sup> Wachsmuth, p. 330.

<sup>3</sup> Work cited, p. 137.

## V.—THE DYING ALEXANDER OF THE UFFIZI GALLERY AND THE GIGANTOMACHIA OF PERGAMUM.

No. 318, of the sculptures in the Uffizi collection, has long been known as the Dying Alexander. This name has been retained for want of a better, archaeologists having come to no agreement concerning it further than a general recognition of the truth of Otfried Mueller's remark (*Ancient Art and its Remains*, § 129, Note 4): "The head of the Dying Alexander at Florence is an archaeological enigma." The work represents the head of a young man whose beardless face is turned to the right and upward. The agonized tension of the eyebrow muscles and the open lips conspire with this turn of the countenance to express deep physical or mental suffering; akin to that of the Laocoön, it is represented by the same means. Long and wavy hair, rising from the forehead and falling, manelike, down either side of the face, serves as a frame to this picture of pain. The work has undergone considerable injuries and has been subjected to much restoration; according to H. Meyer, a large portion of the hair on the back of the head and of the curls about the face is new, also most of the nose, and the breast and shoulders with part of the neck.

As the pedestal has engraved upon it the name ALESSANDRO, the identification with Alexander the Great is probably as old as the restoration. It is not without interest to trace it to the complex misapprehension on which it rests. Plutarch, *Alex. M.* 4, writes as follows: *Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἰδέαν τοῦ σώματος οἱ Λυσίππειοι μάλιστα τῶν ἀνδριάντων ἐμφαίνουσιν, ὑφ' οὗ μόνου καὶ αὐτὸς ἡξίου πλάττεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ ἃ μάλιστα πολλοὶ τῶν διαδόχων ὕστερον καὶ τῶν φίλων ἀπεμμούνητο, τήν τ' ἀνάτυσιν τοῦ αὐχένος εἰς εὐώνυμον ἡσυχῇ κεκλιμένου, καὶ τὴν ὑγρότητα τῶν ὀμμάτων, διατετήρηκεν ἀκριβῶς ὁ τεχνίτης.* Another passage that may very probably have had to do with the naming of the bust is Plutarch *de Alex. M. virtute aut fortuna* II, 2: *Λυσίππου δὲ τὸ πρῶτον Ἀλέξανδρον πλάσαντος ἄνω βλέποντα τῷ προσώπῳ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὥσπερ αὐτὸς εἰώθει βλέπειν Ἀλέξανδρος, ἡσυχῇ παρεγκλίνων τὸν τράχηλον, ἐπέγραψέ τις οὐκ ἀπιθάνως·*

*αὐδασοῦντι δ' ἔοικεν ὁ χάλκεος εἰς Δία λεύσσων·  
γὰρ ὑπ' ἐμοὶ τίθεμαι, Ζεῦ σὺ δ' Ὀλυμπον ἔχε.*





has entwined itself about his limbs and rendered him helpless ; it was probably also biting him. His doom is sealed, as is that of his brethren ; Ge, rising, near by, out of the ground, is powerless to save her child, for already Nike brings Athena the crown of victory. It has been noticed that the care taken by the artist to leave the magnificent torso unhidden by the folds of the serpent suggests the Laocoön, where the same caution is conspicuous. The head, thrown back in despair, reminds us of the Alexander. The pendant to this group was that represented on Plate III ; here also a god has overcome a young giant of human figure. To quote Conze : " Mightiest of all the gods, Zeus, in wide wind-blown mantle, his body uncovered, strides in battle ; his head, unhappily, is lost, his right hand wielded a thunderbolt, with his left he advances the aegis, his shield and weapon. On either side a vanquished giant falls ; the one to the left with the shield, his thigh bored through and through by the three-pronged, flaming lightning-bolt, raises his right hand in supplication ; he to the right, in front of the god below the aegis, rests on his knee and with his left hand seizes his right shoulder—as if struck there, was my notion. But Herr Bode recognizes in this motion, in the knotted muscles of the right arm, in the contracted sides, a being actually writhing in a fit before the god's aegis. As I hear, he has the approval of physicians, and his explanation is one not at variance with the spirit of these reliefs." The face of this fallen giant is broken off, but it is highly probable that in the " Dying Alexander " we have a copy of the head that once occupied this place. The giant whose skin-covered arm is outstretched above this one's head has been found imitated on a Roman sarcophagus, so that there is nothing remarkable in the supposition advanced ; for its substantiation it must depend on the coincidence of the required and given features. As this is a question to be decided by the eyes rather than by the understanding, I have prepared a drawing of the giant with the head restored, that is to say, copied in from a photograph of the Alexander taken before the finds at Pergamum were made. It is noteworthy that I did not have to alter the angle of vision, inasmuch as this shows that the point of view most advantageous for the Alexander naturally presents the head in the position which is the only possible one in the relief. I have taken no liberties other than making a few changes in the restored portions of the hair and slightly lengthening one side of the neck above the giant's left shoulder. This last was necessary in order

to direct the giant's gaze to the aegis that, whatever we may think of Herr Bode's remarkable suggestion, so strongly affects him.

As the appropriateness of the expression of the giant's recovered face is self-evident, the perfect correspondence with that of the match figure in the pendant group, the giant subdued by Athena, is the only thing that remains to be pointed out. A subtle Greek sense of proportion would require the adversary of the greater god to be cast in a larger mould, and this holds good of the pair. Perhaps the rather too large proportions I have given to the head exaggerate this impression.

It is a curious corroboration of the theory advanced that Overbeck (*Kunstarch. Vorles.*, p. 137, quoted by Wieseler in Müller's *DAK.*), seeing in the Florentine bust the expression of "a sudden, surprising pain," suggested an altogether analogous subject: "Capaneus, at the moment when Zeus' thunderbolt strikes him in the neck and is about to hurl him from the scaling-ladder."

ALFRED EMERSON.

## NOTES.

### PROPERTIUS III (IV) 7, 47-50.

While discussing Mr. Postgate's edition of Propertius' with a friend who had found it helpful in his classes, the verses cited at the head of this note came up for consideration, and on the spur of the moment I suggested an interpretation, which I felt to be venturesome, but, as my view excited lively opposition, I began to take a deeper interest in the passage, and a few hours afterwards lighted on a confirmation of my theory, which, if I mistake not, has never been advanced before.

Propertius III (IV) 7 is an elegy on the loss at sea of Paetus, a young man about town who had undertaken to mend his fortunes

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Postgate's excellent edition of Select Elegies of Propertius interested me so much when it first appeared (in 1881) that I called the attention of some of my Latinist friends to the book, in the hope that some special student of Propertius might give the readers of the Journal a just appreciation of the labor and thought and ingenuity that Mr. Postgate has expended on his author. But among the many troubles of the editor of a philological journal in America, not the least is the difficulty of procuring reviews by those best qualified to make them, and as my own knowledge of Propertius did not and does not warrant me to sit in judgment on Mr. Postgate's special work, I have not thought it worth while to write a notice which should contain little more than a string of points in which I differ with Mr. Postgate on general principles. Such a review would have produced an unfavorable effect on the reader, while in point of fact I hold the book in high esteem and have studied it with great pleasure. Slips there are, such as a curious mistranslation of so familiar a passage as Xen. Anab. 2, 3, 25: οὐχ ἦκεν ὥσθ' οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐφρόντιζον, 'he did not come; so (we may conclude) the Greeks were wise'; and in the grammatical notes Mr. Postgate sees too much, and sometimes beclouds a very simple matter by a mass of verbiage. So where he explains an everyday construction like 'si patiare, levest' (II 5, 16) in this way: "An 'allied fact' (a 'general truth' *levest*) is here substituted for the proper hypothetical apodosis (the particular statement 'you will be relieved'). See Roby, 1574 (1). 'You will see the truth of the general statement that the woe is light, supposing you bear it.' All this on 'omne in amore malum, si patiare, levest,' where *patiare* is the ideal second person, not Cynthia, but any loving soul. My admiration of Mr. Roby's syntax has its limits, but I hardly

by engaging in mercantile pursuits. His ship went down on the voyage to Alexandria.

Tu (Pecunia) Paetum ad Pharios tendentem lintea portus  
obruis insano terque quaterque mari.

Then we have the usual homily on land and water and the more or less familiar mythic parallels. The close of the poem dwells especially on the hardship that so young and tender a lad should have perished by so cruel a death. And the characteristic of the youth begins v. 47 :

Non tulit hic Paetus stridorem audire procellae  
et duro teneras laedere fune manus,  
sed thyio in thalamo aut Oricia terebintho  
effultum pluma versicolore caput.

This is the text as Mr. Postgate would have it, though he prints '*hunc* Paetus' both in text and notes. Baehrens, v. 47, has *hoc* in anticipation of *audire* which is more simple, but '*hic* Paetus' brings before us the style of the man, 'this Paetus of ours,' whatever another Paetus might do, and if Propertius had been gifted with prophetic foresight he would have known that there would be a Paetus of a very different stamp. Notice the iteration in what

thought it possible that he could have stated so common a case so badly, and on turning to his grammar I found that he provides for this class in 1546, although he has not been careful to separate it from the other and less common class of sentences of which the type is: 'si verum excutias, facies, non uxor amatur,' in which the real apodosis is the ascertainment of the predicate (reperias faciem, non uxorem amari). Then, as Mr. Postgate has taken a dislike to Ovid, who had genius enough for half a dozen small poets, he is not satisfied with calling him an 'inferior Cicero in verse,' but hounds him down as a purloiner of Propertian tidbits, and that on the slenderest grounds; 'post cineres,' for instance, is cited as a theft, a phrase which that 'conscious pedant Persius' also twists into 'cinere ulterior,' and even Minucius Felix cribs in his Octavius 11: post mortem et cineres et favillas. Ovid cannot even use *nunc* and *umbra* in peace, though Propertius himself, as Mr. Postgate tells us, has in his possession a phrase which coincides remarkably with a passage quoted from C. Gracchus by Cic. De Orat. 2, 67, 269. That phrase is: Quid tibi vis, insane? But I am going to be more generous than Mr. Postgate. Macaulay, in his Ballad of Virginia, says 'And now mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this.' 'There is no way but this' occurs in Shakespeare *totidem verbis* (Twelfth Night, Act III, Sc. 2); but I do not accuse Macaulay of plagiarism despite his prodigious memory. However, I am determined not to lapse into a faultfinding criticism of a book which is not only far superior to the run of editions, not only useful for classes, but is full of genuine learning and manifold suggestiveness.

follows v. 51 *huic*, v. 53 *hunc* with the πολύπτωτον so characteristic of artificial poetry. For *effultum* Baehrens retains *et fultum*. Into the criticism of the rest I do not enter. *Non tulit* is οὐκ ἔτλη = *non is fuit qui ferret*, from which we get for the contrast *sed is fuit qui mallet*. 'This Paetus was not the man to bear the sound of the piping storm, but he was the man (to have) his head propped on feather pillow of shot colors in a chamber of thyine wood or (of) Orician terebinth.' This chamber the commentators have sought on land and sought in a real chamber. But we know that Paetus was in narrow circumstances (*pauper*, v. 48) and had no such luxurious chamber or bed as Mr. Postgate would render it. Propertius simply tells us what Paetus would have preferred. But the *thalamus* is not a chamber on land nor yet a bed. It is a stateroom, the stateroom of such a ship as the Romans must have known as well as we know Cleopatra's barge in Shakespeare, the ship of Hieron, built under the direction of Archimedes and fully described by Athenaios, 5, p. 206. Of this ship we read θαλάμους δὲ τρεῖς εἶχε τρικλίνους (p. 207 C), and further: ἀφροδίσιον κατεσκεύαστο τρίκλινον . . . τοὺς τοίχους δ' εἶχε καὶ τὴν ὀροφὴν κυπαρίττου τὰς δὲ θύρας ἐλέφαντος καὶ θύου. This was the kind of seagoing environment that our Paetus was fit for, not the rough work of the deck that the mannish Roman lady Juvenal delighted in (*duros gaudet tractare rudentis*).

B. L. G.

#### CONIECTURAE BABRIANAE.

16, 17, Rutherford:

τί σε δροσίζει νῶτον ἔνυχος στίβη,  
καὶ καῦμα θάλπει, πάντα καὶ κατακναίει;

haps καὶ καῦμα θάλπει πανταχῇ κατακναίει.

V 8: τὰς δ' ἰδίας ἀφῆκε μακρὰ λιμώττειν.

: seems possible that *ιδίας* is a mistake for *ἡμέρας*, the tame goats. has just before mentioned the other αἴγας κερούχους ἀγρίας πολλὰς ὅν αὐτὸς ἤγα.

ζ 12: ὥς ἂν βλέποιο τὸν πέλας τί βουλεύοι.

Rutherford reads after Gitlbauer:

ὥς ἂν βλέποι τὸ τοῦ πέλας τί βουλεύοι

against the Babrian rules of rhythm. It would be better to retain βλέπειτο as a passive, and reading τοῦ πέλας, make the genitive depend on the substantival notion contained in τί βουλεύοι, 'that so might be seen in one's neighbor, what he was purposing' = 'one's neighbor's intention.'

LXIII 9: κακῶν δὲ πάντων ἄτε σύνεστιν ἀνθρώποις  
δοτῆρες ἡμεῖς.

Perhaps ἄττ' ἔνεστιν. At any rate ἄτε seems impossible.

LXXXIX 5: ἐγὼ οὐ περυσινός· ἐπ' ἔτος ἐγεννήθην.

Rutherford seems right in supplying a negative to ἐγεννήθην; but I would then recast the verse as follows:

ἐγὼ περυσινός; ἐπ' ἔτος οὐκ ἐγεννήθην.

I do not believe Babrius could have admitted so faulty a rhythm as οὐκ ἐπ' ἔτος ἐγεννήθην.

XCV 75: καὶ νῦν ἐκεῖνος πλεῖον ἢ σὺ θυμοῦται.

θυμαίνει is an obvious correction.

XCIX 2, 3: χῶ λέων τί κωλύει;  
πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν, ἄλλ' ἐνέχυρον δώσεις  
τῷ κυπτέρῳ σου μὴ μεθιέναι πίστιν.

Rutherford writes ἄλλ' ἐπ' ἐνεχύρῳ δώσεις and adds in his note that he considers this conjecture certain. I should much prefer, taking a feather from his own wing, to write

ἄλλ' ἐνέχυρον οὐ δώσεις  
τῷ κυπτέρῳ σου μὴ μεθιέναι πίστιν;

'But won't you give your two quill-feathers as a pledge of your fidelity?'

R. ELLIS.

<sup>1</sup> Professor Ellis has published a review of Rutherford's Babrius in the Philologische Rundschau of May 19, 1883. Among the certain emendations he classes ἡμεῖ for οἶμοι 34, 7 (which is, indeed, perfect); ἀλετρεύων for λατρεύων 129, 5 (also very good); θηραγρευταῖς for φιλαγρευταῖς 107, 10—a large percentage of successes.  
B. L. G.

## CES.

und E. KOSCHWITZ.

in the first edition in  
uage which has often  
o orthography. Their  
aphy that are contrary  
language long since  
ces should correspond  
n course without any  
e old language, as has  
ance of which is thus  
that time. Of course,

arest to the primitive  
elopment and historic  
tions noted, both for  
arated periods of the  
full of interest to the  
scholars, Gaston Paris,

But while the details  
the middle ages down  
assonance into rhyme,  
s been almost wholly  
oup of languages. It  
the first definite and  
celebrated Girart de  
n, nach allen erreich-

7 step forward is beset  
ences of conscientious  
r of the paper before  
rit of having given us  
tempt, here and there,

have hitherto been  
els himself unable to

the reader will find  
des Oxforder Textes  
a, e, o, u are treated,  
ring nasal and, with  
aced by a reinvestiga-

tion of the much-vexed MS-problem, in the solution of which, with reference to their language and relations, he sides with Profs. Förster (Roman-Stud. V 95 seq.) and Stengel (Jahrbuch XII 119 seq.), who maintain that parts of the Oxford Codex are interpolations by a later hand, in opposition to Paul Meyer, who draws precisely upon these parts to prove the identity of origin of two of the most important MSS of this epic.

The general results obtained by the writer from his investigation of the assonance may be summed up about as follows: This epic was originally composed in neither pure Provençal nor pure French, but in a mixed language, which must be supposed for the first cast of this Roman, just as for the *Croisade contre les Albigeois*, for Daurel, Beton and Aigar. The essential characteristics of such a mixed dialect have been determined for the eastern branch of it, by Ascoli in his Arch. Glott. III, Schizzi Francoprovenzali, which extended in the beginning along the whole boundary line between the Langue d'oc and Langue d'oïl territories, and is preserved to us in a number of scattered linguistic remnants outside of the above-mentioned epic productions. The disappearance of this species from the main body of the literature of that time is attributed to the overwhelming influence of the Limousin court language, which had become so popular with the Troubadors as to be characterized the *dreg Limosi*, the development of which was wholly similar to what took place two hundred years later for the Isle de France. To this influence must also be ascribed the difference of language which exists between the MSS of these fragmentary epics on the one hand and those of the rhymed compositions on the other. As to the question whether these epics preserved to us contain one and the same dialect variety, or whether different dialects show themselves in this mixed Franco-provençal speech, M. holds to the latter view, and supports it with abundant proof throughout the course of his work. Daurel and the *Croisade*, for example, belong to the western group, while Aigar and Girart are assigned to the eastern division of the linguistic medley. The difference between Aigar and Girart consists principally in the characteristic treatment of *e* (*ē*, *ī*) and *o* in the latter, which separates it sharply from the other three texts.

Everything pertaining to this celebrated Girart Roman has been clouded in such mystery that, notwithstanding the large number of works published on the subject, little has been done to clear up the uncertainty which clings about its origin both in point of history and language. The present contribution has thrown decided light on the latter of these difficult problems, and has incidentally given us many interesting details concerning the more exact relations of the Provençal dialects, and especially those varieties that make up the belt of mixed speech lying along the border line of the Langue d'oc and Langue d'oïl species.

6 Heft.

It is now about ten years since the modern school of young grammarians, among whom stand Paul, Brugman and Osthoff as chief representatives to-day, began to make its influence specially felt in Germany in opposition to the analytical processes and dissecting mania of the old advocates of descriptive grammar. Their fundamental doctrine, that all phonetic change takes place according to absolute and inviolable laws, was boldly stated and developed





For the strong perfects the writer sets apart a special division in his work, since they occupy an exceptional position, and have as their basis in Latin an already modified present stem. A few interesting results obtained for this class are worthy of note, viz. the second person singular of such modern *prae-terita* as *vins* (venir), *tins* (tenir)—in the old language *ven-is*, *ten-is*, respectively—have passed through the intermediate forms *veins*, *teins*, before reaching the present contracted stage. So, too, with the corresponding stem-vowel forms for the first and second persons plural. The limits of this transformation period, in which *venis*, through *veins*, passed into *vins*, are put down from 1450–1550.

Again, for perfects of which *oi* (habui) is a representative (for example, *poi pavi*, *ploi placui*, *poi potui*, *soi sapui*, *toi tacui*), four distinct conjugational types are traced in the dialects that throw much light on the mode of growth of the Modern French so-called irregular forms. For the singular, we have (1) *oi ous out*, (2) *oi eus ot*, (3) *euch eus eut*, (4) *au awis aut*—the plurals of which are *oumes oustes ourent*, *eumes eustes orent*, *eumes eustes eurent*, *awimes awistes aurent*. No. 1 represents the Norman type; No. 2 comes up in most non-Norman documents; while Nos. 3 and 4 are dialect productions of the north and northeast. In and round about Amiens particularly is to be found the original home of the *eu-*diphthong species, which afterwards spread and became very abundant throughout the north. A forcible illustration of the passage, by analogy, from one grammar category to another presents itself in the sigma-perfects of such verbs as *prendre* (*pris*), *mettre* (*mis*), *dire* (*dis*), etc. The theory generally held with reference to this class is that the second person singular of the modern language is an analogical formation on the third singular, that is, Old French *pris*, *pres-is*, *prist* = modern *pris*, *pris*, *prit*, by the simple syncopation of medial *s* in *presis* and the contraction of *preis* to *pris*. The sibilant never falls out, however, in such cases in French, and hence the forms *preis*, *preimes*, *preistes* would become unexplainable by this hypothesis, but according to B.'s investigation these *si-*perfects have passed over into the class of *i-*perfects, that give the regular model *vi* (*vīdi*) *ve-is* *vit*, and by analogy to it we have our present second person singular, and first and second persons plural.

In the same way a number of perfects that originally belong to the sigma division have passed over within the literary period into the *ui-*class, or settled down altogether in the weak verb conjugation.

The author adds two very full alphabetical registers to his work, one for all the verbs, the other for all nouns and adjectives treated in it.

One only has to glance through such a contribution as this to recognize the great difficulty of writing to-day a general historical French grammar that shall in any degree represent the present status of the science. Diez troubled himself very little about dialect influence in the production of grammar forms, being satisfied to set down the resemblances to or deviations from the Latin, but the grammarian of the present is expected to trace the tangled threads of each dialect variety that helps to form the complex texture of the modern linguistic fabric. To this end the paper before us is a most valuable auxiliary, and will do much, without doubt, to stimulate further research in the rich field of dialect effects upon the composite body of our modern grammar.

## 7 Heft.

Old French syntax has been the subject of investigation in a long series of monographs that present us with the laws of word-position for a given, isolated period of the language and for a certain author, without in any way establishing his relation to his times, and often without even mentioning the model types of expression of the mother-tongue which were his constant companions. That these special studies were the necessary forerunners to a general system of syntax is evident, but that they only give us a partial and, for the most part, a very imperfect idea of the complex phenomena out of which they naturally grew up is manifest to any one who, through them, attempts to get at the philosophy of thought-expression for any particular phase of the language which they claim to represent. The tendencies of language are so diverse and depend so much upon the varying products of intelligence, developed out of what is gathered from those about us, that the characteristic coloring of an author's phrase can only be appreciated in many cases by a study of his inner life as the result of all the changing influences of his epoch. It is for this reason that the separate treatises just mentioned often seem to give us contradictory results, in only tracing the rich and varied growth of the Old French sentence for the individual author; but these discrepancies either disappear altogether, or are reduced to a few peculiarities of special style, when each literary monument is considered as a simple factor, a single link in the chain that binds the historic traditions of the mother-tongue to the set and rigid formula of the modern idiom. The differentiating tendencies of the Old French in the earliest stages of its structural development are so numerous, the modes of expression often so naïve and original, that the collection of them into a well-rounded, systematic whole, so that they may be viewed from the standpoint of a more general word-relation, cannot fail, I think, to be of interest to many scholars who are not versed in the details of this particular branch of syntax. For the student of Latin, especially, does this early period of modern phrase-building offer a rich source for fruitful research, in that he may frequently find here the more logical, natural expression of thought—the so-called exceptions to rule—highly developed, but of which he has only the meagre traces in the artificial constructions of the classic writers. It is, therefore, with pleasure that we greet any attempt to give us a general survey of word-relation, for however limited a period it may be, of this transition stage between the latest Low Latin usages and the more settled forms of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Such is the little work of fifty-six octavo pages published as the last number of Vol. III of the *Französische Studien—Die Wortstellung in den ältesten französischen Sprachdenkmälern*, von Bernard Völlker—in which the author covers the field for all the most important monuments of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, that is, *Les Serments de Strasbourg*, *Cantilène de Sainte Eulalie*, *Fragment de Valenciennes*, *Passion du Christ*, *Vie de Saint Léger*, *Vie de Saint Alexis*, *Gormond et Isembard*, and the *Chanson de Roland*.

For all cases where these texts do not agree in their word arrangement, each one is treated separately, and note carefully taken as to whether a given peculiarity is due to assonance or some other probable cause, and whether it has continued to live as a typical or exceptional form in the later language. For the method of investigation we find here many points taken from Morf's Wort-

stellung im Rolandsliede, but for the real division and distribution of his material the author depends on the system adopted by Prof. Körting of Münster in his *Französ. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1872. An interesting feature throughout the work is the precise way in which, when we have two varying constructions belonging to the same grammar category, the percentage of each and their changing relations for each individual document are stated. Thus in the Latin, as we know, the personal pronoun subject was indicated, as a rule, by the terminations of the verbal predicate, while in modern French the constant use of the pronominal subject is required. Here the Old French holds a middle position between these two, and in its oldest period shows a strong preference for the Latin usage, especially in dependent clauses. For principal clauses the constructions nearly balance, as is seen by the results of V.'s investigation, viz :

		<i>Expressed.</i>	<i>Omitted.</i>
Principal Clauses.—	Eulalie	50 per cent.	50 per cent.
	Passion	54	46
	Alexis	49	51
	Gormond	54	46
Subordinate Clauses.—	Passion	62	38
	Alexis	60	40
	Gormond	67	33

In these literary monuments of the Old French, however, the language cannot be considered as identical with the folkspeech, since their authors in many cases not only read and wrote Latin, but also thought in it, and hence, however exact the results may be for the texts that have come down to us, we may presume that the differences of construction were much less marked and the speech more uniform among the people. What Schlickum discovered with reference to the inversion of the subject for the thirteenth century French of Aucassin and Nicolette is here confirmed by the tenth and eleventh century language, that is, that no such thing exists as arbitrary inversion, but that it is dependent upon fixed rules, which, though not so absolute and inviolable as in A. and N., yet hold their sway with rigid force for certain well-defined positions. As the narrative flows on in this early stage of the language by principal clauses of limited compass the inverted order is much more frequently developed here than in the subordinate clauses, which number only about half as many examples as the former. No trace is yet found of that species of inversion so common to Modern French, where in an interrogative sentence the substantival subject is expressed at the beginning and then taken up again after the verb by a pronoun: *e. g. Le doge . . . n'a-t-il plus rien à dire ?*

Marx, in his *Wortstellung bei Joinville* (XIII century), fails to notice a mode of treatment of the relative pronoun which characterizes in a forcible manner the Old as contradistinguished from the Modern French according to V.'s investigation. Where the subordinate clause is introduced by the relative, which in the later language has a decided predilection for post-position with reference to the verb, in the earlier idiom a very strong tendency is shown against this freedom. In fact, we only find here pre-position, except in cases where, for metrical reasons, another distribution of the phrase elements is conditioned.

Both in its mode of dealing with predicative attributes and in the relation of object to verb the French language up to the end of the eleventh century (epoch of composition of the Clermont documents, *Passion* and *St. Léger*) shows a most decided tendency to make them always precede the verb. Here we recognize Latin influence as the basis of construction, from which the language in the course of time cut loose, and finally the object receives its characteristic position after the verb—an arrangement of the phrase elements necessitated by the complete disappearance of flexional endings. For the first five texts examined the average relation stands (object + verb) 97 : 56 (verb + object). In the *Passion* we find it reduces to 56 : 30, while a little later in the *St. Léger* the difference becomes still less, 30 : 20, and finally, half a century further on—middle of the eleventh century—the order is inverted and the *Alexis* gives us 43 : 87, wherein we see that the language has acquired more stability, a more constant, definite shape, and is rapidly nearing the Modern French type.

For the construction of the adjective we find a confirmation of Diez' and Krüger's assertion, in opposition to Morf, that the tendency of the Old French is towards pre-position, which takes place almost universally in the oldest poetic compositions. Traces, however, of the Modern French post-position rule appear in the later compositions of this period, and particularly in the *Chanson de Roland* (end of the XI century), while in *Joinville* (XIII century) the present usage has become fully established.

For the adverb a striking contrast to the modern rule presents itself here in that it always shows a certain mobility in reference to position, but notwithstanding this changeable nature it always keeps up a close relation to the primitive word to which it refers, and in a great majority of cases precedes it. It is to the first half of the twelfth century that we have to assign the change of position for the adverbial attributes, as in the *Chanson de Roland* pre-position is predominant, while in *Crestien de Troyes* (XIII century) the Modern French post-position has become richly developed.

The writer of this paper promises us another soon, which shall continue the work on down through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and thus give us a complete system of Old French syntax. The principal merit of his contribution is its general character. In it he has acted rather the part of compiler, throwing together and succinctly stating results of research and observations scattered through a large number of special treatises. The sharp contrast to or agreement with the Modern French syntax is noted with care, but the student who is not familiar with the older stage of the language will find the lack of examples a very great disadvantage for comparative study. References are given in abundance, and yet but few citations, which will make any practical use of it clumsy and unsatisfactory. The Latin construction, too, is frequently called up by way of illustration, but here again all examples are wanting, and the force of the illustration is much weakened or lost altogether in the effort to seek out the cognate word arrangement. No mention whatever is made of similar forms of sentence in the other Romance languages. In spite of all these minor imperfections, however, both the Romance scholar in particular and the general student of syntax will welcome this little work as a valuable help towards filling in one more important gap in our knowledge of the characteristic modes of expression belonging to a special domain of human thought.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

L'Egitto al Tempo dei Greci e dei Romani. Di GIACOMO LUMBROSO. Roma, Fratelli Bocca, 1882. 8vo, 204 pp.

Time was when Italians were the great scholars of Europe, and, though in the last two hundred years they have in some respects been outstripped by the Germans, the Dutch, and even at times by the English and French, there has been no period since the revival of letters when Italy did not contain a few men devoted to learning. Unfortunately, however, amid the fanaticism for things German that has lately become epidemic in the learned world, Italian scholarship, like everything else Italian of any value, has been wellnigh lost sight of. The result has been that while the rawest and flimsiest productions of new-fledged German doctors have been reviewed and puffed and circulated everywhere, the well-weighed works of ripe Italian scholars lie unread and unheeded on the shelves of Italian libraries. This is all the more to be deplored that ripe Italian scholarship is of a very high order, indeed of a type perhaps superior to any other. It is as exact and painstaking as the German without being unwieldy or chimerical; elegant as the French without being superficial; as solid as the English without being prosaic, and as comprehensive as the Dutch without losing itself in minutiae. In a word, Italian scholars combine exhaustive knowledge of facts and texts with correct judgment, well regulated imagination, orderly statement, and a clear, manly style of expression.

Of these characteristics the work before us is a favorable example. *Egypt in the Time of the Greeks and Romans* reads almost like one of Ebers' novels, and yet there is hardly a statement in it that is not solidly based upon authorities, ancient or modern, carefully weighed and often very shrewdly commented upon and corrected. The variety of subjects embraced in it may best be seen from the titles of the twenty-five chapters into which it is divided. These are I. Worship of the Nile. II. Representations of things from the Nile: the Palestrina mosaic. III. The Nile from a practical and positive point of view. IV. Deserts bounding the Nile valley: Ancient roads. V. Manners and customs of travellers in the desert. VI. Southern confines; Pescennius Niger in the Thebaid. VII. Pelusium. VIII. Cyrene. IX. The Egyptians under Greek and Roman rule. X. Greek citizenship. XI. The military class. XII. Alexandria. XIII. Character of the Alexandrines. XIV. Games and spectacles. XV. Worship of Dionysos. XVI. Worship of Serapis. Sacred medicine. XVII. Alexander in the Greek romance, *The Acts of Alexander the Great*. XVIII. Worship and priest of Alexander the Great. XIX. Temple and Hymn to Augustus. XX. View of Alexandria at the beginning of the Empire. XXI. The architect and inscription of the Pharos. XXII. The Necropolis of Alexandria and the mummies of the Middle Ages. XXIII. Hills of broken pottery at Alexandria (Monti Testacci). XXIV. Pompey's pillar. XXV. Epilogue.

The whole chapter upon the worship of the Nile and the ceremonies connected with it sheds a curious light upon the growth of religious ideas. Towards the end of it a tempting suggestion is thrown out as to the meaning of the first line of Euripides' *Helena*: "Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί." The description of the Palestrina mosaic is very graphic, and well worth considering the suggestion (due to E. Q. Visconti) that it was made in imitation of the Egyptian carpets, so much prized by the Romans under the Empire. Indeed Prof. Lumbroso shows that the influence of Egypt upon the Romans

was very much more extensive than is generally supposed, affecting almost every sphere of life, action and thought.

The account of the canals of the Nile, their construction, locality, and the officers appointed to take charge of them, is full of curious facts which help us to form a picture of life in Egypt in the centuries immediately before and after Christ. Who would suspect that the modern Egyptian term *Djerme* or *Germe* is only the Greek *διάρημα*?<sup>1</sup> In chapter IV is collected all the information obtainable with respect to the little-visited desert lying between the Nile valley and the Red Sea. It contains long extracts from the MS journal of Matt. Bert and Raffenu-Delile, who visited this desert in 1800. This journal was long supposed to have been lost, but was discovered by Prof. Lumbroso in the King's library at Turin. According to this, it appears that there still exist considerable remains of the old Roman roads that crossed the desert, with their *ὕδρεύματα* or castle-like watering stations.

Passing over several chapters we come to the ninth, which describes the condition of the native Egyptians under the Greeks and Romans. And what a condition! As we read the details of it, we ask ourselves: Is it possible for a conquering people to be just? And to think that this condition has lasted for considerably over two thousand years! Whether ruled by Ptolemy, Caesar, Khalif, Sultan or Khedive, the poor Egyptians have always been the same down-trodden, suffering people; and their future, alas! looks no brighter than their past. *Vae victis!*

The Greek settlers in Egypt, as described in Chapter X, present the same phenomena that Greek settlers in all regions did—personal selfishness, social corruption, political injustice and tyranny. It is sad to think that the most gifted people that the world ever saw should, when they lost the instinct of liberty, have sunk into depths of moral debasement which it is almost impossible to fathom. As we read Prof. Lumbroso's account of social life in Alexandria, we seem to be reading an account of Naples under the Bourbons. And even at this hour Naples suffers the awful consequences of being a Greek colony. If the Greek settlers were bad, the foreign military class described in Chapter XI were certainly no better.

The remaining chapters treat mainly of Alexandria, its buildings, public works, people, amusements, library, light-house, necropolis, etc., etc. Alexandria was in many respects the Paris of the ancient world and the Alexandrines were its Parisians. Prof. Lumbroso's account of both is most vivid and telling, but by no means flattering to the latter. In Chapter XIII he gives a very shrewd interpretation of a passage from Lampridius, which hitherto has baffled scholars. It is this: "*Volebat (Alexander Severus) videri originem de Romanorum gente trahere, quia eum pudebat Syrum dici, maxime quod quodam tempore festo ut solent ANTIOCHENSES, ÆGYPTII, ALEXANDRINI lacessiverant eum convitiolis.*" After quoting the opinions, suggestions and Teutonic guesses of the various editors, he proposes simply to omit the comma after *Antiochenses*, which omis-

<sup>1</sup>As *διάρημα* is not in Liddell and Scott, some of the readers of the Journal may like to know that this strange word occurs in Procop. de Aedif. 6, 1, p. 109 A . . . ἐς λέμβους δὲ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον σῆτον . . . μεταβιβάσαντες, οὗσπερ καλεῖν διάρῆματα νενομίκασιν κτέ. Professor Sophocles in his lexicon s. v. evidently identifies the modern Egyptian with the Greek word, for he adds: 'The modern Egyptian *j e r m* has usually two large *lateen-sails*.'—B. L. G.



sion makes the last clause mean, "On a certain festal occasion (carnival) those Egyptian Antiochenes, the Alexandrines had jibed him." This gives just the sense required, and Prof. Lumbroso shows that the Antiochenes were as famous in ancient times for their rude jibes as the Sachsenhäuser are at the present day, and that the Alexandrines were not far, if anything, behind them. Very apt is the quotation from Ausonius respecting Antioch and Alexandria:

"Ambarum locus unus . . . Turbida vulgo  
Utraque, et amentis populi male sana tumultu."

The amusements of the Alexandrines, described in Chap. XIV, bespeak a people of brutal and depraved tastes. It seems they had great skill in training animals to all sorts of human-like accomplishments. They had elephants who could speak Greek and write (hieroglyphics?), and monkeys who could dance the Pyrrhic, drive tandem, and read! Prof. Lumbroso makes it evident that many of the most barbarous amusements to which the Romans of the empire gave themselves up were direct importations from Alexandria.

In no way superior to their amusements were the religious ceremonies of the Alexandrines. Their chief divinities seem to have been the god of drunkenness (Dionysos), the god of quack medicine (Serapis), and their own dissolute kings. The Roman practice of divinizing emperors was plainly borrowed from the Alexandrines. Very curious is the story told of how the Christians, when they got the upper hand, transferred the healing sanctuary of Serapis to the Saints Cyrus and John and continued the quackery on their own behalf, to the great disgust of the regular physicians. It seems the saints were homœopaths, while the Asklepiads were allopaths—which perhaps explains the mutual jealousy.<sup>1</sup>

In Chapter XVII Prof. Lumbroso shows that the Greek romance *The Acts of Alexander the Great*, though untrustworthy in regard to the facts of the hero's life, was written by some one well acquainted with Alexandria, and is, therefore, of great value in connection with the topography of that city, whose extent appears to have been at one time almost equal to that of London. The account of the worship rendered to Alexander and Augustus is repulsively interesting. Chapter XX, entitled *View of Alexandria at the beginning of the empire*, contains many curious pieces of information, among them this, that the two obelisks, the one of which has recently been removed to London and the other to New York, were connected with the *Καϊσάρειον*, or temple of Caesar Epibaterios (*i. e.* Augustus).

In Chapter XXI the author throws cold water upon the story told by Loukian respecting the inscription on the Pharos at Alexandria. He is possibly right; but his explanation of the origin of the story seems to us in the very highest degree fanciful and improbable.

It is curious to learn (Chap. XXI) that the term *Νεκρόπολις*, now so common, was not used in ancient times except to designate the great cemetery of Alexandria, and that the old name for mummy, namely *gdbbara*, was originally the Arabic name for the same spot. *Mummy* itself, it seems, comes from the Arabic *mum* meaning wax. Prof. Lumbroso quotes authorities to show that the tombs of Alexandria were rifled of their mummies in the middle ages.

<sup>1</sup>The writer was present some years ago at the great festival of the miraculously healing Panagia in the island of Tenos, and can testify that priestly quackery is as much alive now in the Greek Church as it was in the early centuries.



The author thinks a good deal of light might be thrown upon the commerce of Alexandria if the *monti testacci* which still exist near the city were opened and their contents examined, and those who know M. Dumont's work upon the inscribed handles of earthenware jars found in the neighborhood of Athens will agree with him. After relating all that is known concerning "Pompey's pillar," he finds it, of course, "a misnomer"; but cannot determine "quale sia stato propriamente il posto, lo scopo e l'integro aspetto del monumento nella città antica." The book closes with a quotation from Chateaubriand.

Pending the general ignorance of Italian on the part of English and American scholars, it would, we think, be well worth while to translate this entertaining book into English.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

---

Reale Accademia dei Lincei (Anno CCLXXIX, 1881-2). L'Omelia di Giacomo di Sarug sul Battesimo di Costantino Imperatore pubblicata, tradotta ed annotata da ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Jun. Roma, coi tipi Salviucci, 1882.

Jacob, or James, of Sarug (A. D. 452-521), bishop of Batna in Mesopotamia, is one of those voluminous Syriac writers whose works have little present intrinsic value, but great incidental importance from a linguistic, historical, or critical point of view. Ecclesiastically (a quality never to be lost sight of in a Syriac author) he was orthodox; or, as we should put it, he adopted all the superstitions and corruptions that were catholic in his time. All the writings fathered upon him number 763; but the genuine are only 231. Of these, two noted ones were a liturgy and one of the (seven) rituals of baptism in use among the Syrian churches. The rest were epistles and homilies; the Syriac homily being regularly a sort of sermon in verse, like Young's Night Thoughts, or Pollock's Course of Time. The Homily on the Baptism of Constantine, now first published by Mr. Frothingham, is extant in two MSS, one in the Vatican (10th cent.), the other in the Brit. Mus. (9th cent.?), besides a fragment in the Bodleian. These MSS are well described by Mr. Frothingham, who takes the Vatican MS as the basis of his printed text, emending it once or twice, and *very* slightly, from the Brit. Mus. MS. It is the most complete; it is dated probably A. D. 919; and its written character is the *Serta*, or that used by the Jacobites and Maronites.

The editing and printing of the Syriac text appear to be very well done. Even the misprints are rare. If the editor has noted *all* the difficult or apparently erroneous spots of the MS, the original script must be exceedingly plain and correct. Once in the printing the first *nun* is changed to a *yud* in the name Constantine; and scarcely anything worse appears in the text. The critical annotations, giving the variant readings of the Brit. Mus. MS and the Bodl. fragment, show great care, and are full of important matter. The variations which they present leave no doubt that the original composition (as in the case of modern songs and hymns) was unscrupulously altered to suit the taste of each editor or copyist. The alterations, however, do little harm; and in one or two instances they clear up a difficulty in the Vatican text. In printing the variant readings, the diacritic points have not been treated with the same care as those in the text—unless, indeed, the MSS themselves were sometimes deficient.

The translation is executed with understanding, and on a scholarly basis. It professes to keep "strettamente al testo," and generally does so; but still the translation is not as literal in all respects as an English scholar would demand. Thus the phrase "exalt the horn of" is reduced to the simple "exalt," although the Italian Bible retains the full expression. "Neglect not, O Lord, thy flock" (p. 33) is rendered "Abbi cura, o Signore, del tuo gregge." Apart from these matters of taste, the translation exhibits a number of oversights, most of them semi-clerical, which mar the beauty of the work, though they are of a comparatively unimportant character. Thus, in the former part of the homily, two words are used to characterize the leprosy of Constantine; one meaning "stinking," the other "hateful." They differ but by one letter, and the translation sometimes confounds them. Words not in the text, but supplied by the translator, are put in parenthesis, but in several instances the parenthesis is wrongly placed, and in others wrongly omitted. Sometimes an essential word is omitted in the translation, and here and there an inaccurate translation seems to occur. Most of these spots, however, seem to be oversights only, and not errors of understanding.

A few promiscuous examples will show the character of these oversights or preferences. P. 33, "una narrazione del tutto maravigliosa" is, more closely, "a narrative which is all of it marvellous." "In ogni bella guisa" is rather "with all good fruits" (or, produce); but the sense is retained. P. 34, line 2, the word for "righteous," as an epithet of Noah, is omitted in the translation. P. 37, "Error thy mother" is translated "l'Errore, tuo padre," and so repeatedly; although Error, mother of Satan, seems to play a female part on one side, that offsets the part taken on the other side by Helena, mother of Constantine. P. 40, "(l'animo)" is wrongly put in a parenthesis that probably belongs about "dicendo," eight lines below. P. 44, parenthesis is put about the first "Maria" instead of the second. The word for "baptize," though technical baptism only can be meant, is generally translated by "immergere," but sometimes by "battizzare." P. 46, "perchè secondo quel che ho udito Cristo Signore per questo venne," though perhaps justifiable in one view, is rather "because I have heard that for this the Lord Messiah came." P. 47, the words "Allora al comando . . . arme spirituali" are not in the text, but supplied from *the substance of* the annotations, and properly belong in the footnotes. Same page, "dalle acque battesimali" is, literally, "from the midst of the depths of the baptism." Of such spots as these there is an average of rather more than one to a page.

The introductory part of the work consists chiefly of a historico-critical investigation of the accretions of fable about the actual nucleus of the conversion and baptism of Constantine, with a brief notice of the place the fables have occupied in art. All this is ably and carefully done. The place of the component parts of this homily in the progression-series of increasing fables is pretty well shown; and the whole investigation is interesting and valuable. At the same time the editor fails to point out (if he recognizes for himself) the fact that Syriac homilies of the sort were written and understood as poetical expansions, not as sober fact. Ephrem's "Repentance of Nineveh" or Milton's "Paradise Lost" marks likewise the existence or the invention of fabulous embellishment. To treat this homily of James as a fable believed by either himself or his auditors is erroneous. A Syriac homily is not a Syriac chronicle.

The editor has crowded so much valuable matter into this work, and, furthermore, has approached it in such an original and fruitful direction, that he may well be excused for leaving to others the matter of its Biblical words and phrases. With one or two exceptions he has avoided in his translation the apparent allusions, even though they might help interpret the homily. The work is to be heartily welcomed. It is much nearer perfection than is to be usually expected of an *editio princeps*.

I. H. H.

---

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken Germanischer Dialecte. Angelsächsische Grammatik von EDUARD SIEVERS. Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1882.

A treatise on Old English grammar, scientifically conceived, independently wrought out, abreast of the highest contemporaneous scholarship, discriminating between the various stages in the development of the language, as well as between the coexistent dialects, and paying due regard to it both as a separate entity and as a member of the Germanic family, has hitherto been a *desideratum*.

How inadequate have been the conceptions which living scholars, as well as those recently deceased, have entertained of phonology, for instance, may be illustrated by reference to one or two manuals lately published. Körner, in his *Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen* (Heilbronn, 1878), thus disposes of the Lautlehre in a note to p. 2: "Eine wissenschaftliche Darstellung der angelsächsischen Lautverhältnisse ist von Grein, Koch und Holtzmann in ihren Grammatiken versucht worden. Sie erfordert Kenntniss der verwanten Dialekte, ist aber, wie sich schon aus dem Folgenden ergeben wird, für das Angelsächsische von besonderer Schwierigkeit und geringem Nutzen; daher ist hier auf sie verzichtet."

Grein, in his *Kurzgefasste Angelsächsische Grammatik* (edited by Professor Wülcker, of Leipzig, in 1879), devotes 7 pages to an introduction, and nearly 15 to a sketch of the Old Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Literature, but only 9 to the Anglo-Saxon vowels, and less than 12 to the consonants.

Holtzmann's *Altdeutsche Grammatik* (1870) contains valuable paragraphs treating of Anglo-Saxon phonology, but the premature death of the author prevented him from finishing even the volume devoted to the phonology of the Germanic dialects. Since that year a number of monographs have been published, chiefly in the form of contributions to periodicals and the proceedings of learned societies, and it was from these scattered pages, not always to be collected without great difficulty, that the student was obliged to glean the facts and theories which would enable him to construct the outlines of Anglo-Saxon grammar. From this labor he is at once relieved by the appearance of Sievers' manual, of which it is scarcely too much to say that it fulfils the various conditions specified in the opening paragraph of this review.

The series of brief grammars of which this forms the third volume, has thus far issued from the hands of the so-called 'Junggrammatiker,' Braune contributing the Gothic Grammar, a model of accuracy and elegant simplicity, and Paul the Middle High German Grammar. We say the so-called 'Junggrammatiker,' for this is an appellation bestowed upon them in derision by their opponents, and never accepted by this little band of earnest and high-hearted scholars;

but by whatever name they are known, it can no longer be disputed that they are accomplishing a revolution, at once beneficial and inevitable, in the methods of comparative philology.

An epoch of riotous and over-fanciful speculation is to be succeeded by one of sober induction; abstractions are no longer to usurp the place of concrete existences, and serve, in the hands of philological jugglers, to mystify at once an uninitiated laity and the hierophants themselves. In short, the scientific temper is to prevail in matters linguistic, an event which is sure to be regarded with dismay both by super-subtlety and by dilettanteism. But whatever be the outcome of the movement, its leaders have contented themselves with very modest professions. Their aim, so far as it may be gathered from their authoritative statements, is but to rescue one small province, that of phonology, from the dominion of caprice and to bring it under the reign of law.

One or two quotations from Paul, whose fondness for philosophical discussion has made him the most prominent expositor of the new doctrines, will serve to characterize the points at issue, and to show how they are regarded by the 'Junggrammatiker.' In the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, Bd. IV, Paul says :

"So lange man es mit den Lautgesetzen nicht sehr streng nahm, so lange fand man nicht sehr viele erhebliche schwierigkeiten bei der vergleichung der germanischen dialecte oder der indogermanischen sprachfamilien unter einander in bezug auf ihre declination und conjugation. Es genügte eine ungefähre ähnlichkeit der formen, die allgemeine möglichkeit oder wahrscheinlichkeit der bei der vergleichung postulierten lautübergänge" . . . pp. 317-8.

"Die voraussetzung, von welcher dabei ausgegangen wird, ist die, dass jedes lautgesetz mit absoluter notwendigkeit wirkt, dass es ebenso wenig eine ausnahme gestattet, wie ein chemisches oder physikalisches gesetz. Mit dieser voraussetzung steht und fällt die von mir befolgte methode. Wer sich entschliesst die erstere zu verwerfen, der braucht auch die letztere nicht anzuerkennen. Er verzichtet aber damit überhaupt auf die möglichkeit, die grammatik zu dem range einer wissenschaft zu erheben." *Beiträge VI 1.*

"Eben das vertrauen zu der absoluten gesetzmässigkeit der lautbewegung ist es, wodurch die sprachwissenschaft der naturwissenschaftlichen evidenz nahe kommt, und wodurch sie in bezug auf sicherheit ihrer resultate allen anderen historischen wissenschaften so sehr überlegen ist. Dieses vertrauen dient ihr wie jeder naturwissenschaft als fundament, auf welcher sie aufgebaut wird. Es wird ihr dadurch das ziel gesteckt, alle lautlichen veränderungen unter gesetze unterzubringen, die mit absoluter consequenz wirken. Dieses ziel dient aber zugleich als prüfstein für die richtigkeit der aufgestellten gesetze und liefert die probleme, welche durch die forschung zu lösen sind. Nirgends darf man sich bei einer vielfältigkeit oder inconsequenz der behandlung eines und desselben lautes unter denselben bedingungen beruhigen. Kann nicht durch andere fassung der lautgesetze abgeholfen werden, so ist die unabweisbare consequenz, dass von den verschiedenartigen veränderungen unter gleichen verhältnissen immer nur die eine auf physiologischen wege entstanden sein kann, während die andere oder die anderen sich auf psychologischen wege, durch formenassociation eingedrängt haben müssen." *Beiträge VI 3.*

But to return from the general principles advocated by this school to the author of the particular volume which we have undertaken to notice. Sievers has made his mark upon the science of comparative philology by his labors in the two allied branches of grammar and phonetics. Before he had undertaken any serious original work he had shown himself a competent translator from modern Scandinavian; his version of Wimmer's *Oldnordisk Formlære*, the standard grammar of Old Norse, was made in 1871, and that of Thomsen's *Den gotiske sprogklasses indflydelse paa den finske* was completed about the same time. His conscientiousness and laboriousness as an editor have been well illustrated in his *Tatian* (1872), *Murbacher Hymnen* (1874), and *Heliand* (1877).

In addition to remarkable industry, his contributions to Paul und Braune's *Beiträge* display acumen of a rare order; in them he attacks no difficulty which he does not in some measure clear up; and even those who repudiate the doctrines advanced by the 'young grammarians' are obliged to concede that papers so rich in lucidly arranged material, and bearing in every part the impress of a master's hand, are indispensable alike to the student of Common Germanic and of the particular dialects treated. But it is as the leader of German phonologists, and the peer of Ellis and Sweet, that Sievers has won the widest and most indefeasible reputation. A keen perception of all shades and varieties of speech-sound, and a rare command of his own vocal organs, enabling him to reproduce any sound articulated in his hearing, and instantly to catch what is popularly denominated the 'accent' of the most difficult and unfamiliar tongue, are the special qualifications which have given him his present standing in this department. His *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie* was published in 1876, and his *Grundzüge der Phonetik* in 1881.

It was not as a tyro, therefore, that he approached the difficult task of writing an Anglo-Saxon grammar. Indeed, the only risk to which he exposed himself was that of disappointing extravagant anticipations. As to the manner in which he has answered these expectations, it is enough to say that his grammar, though we should not dare to affirm that it is the final word on Old English phonology and inflection, does in truth mark a distinct and notable advance upon any similar work which has preceded it, and practically supersedes them all. Since the publication of Grein's '*Sprachschatz*,' no book so indispensable to the non-professional student of Anglo-Saxon has appeared. Nor will it be hardly less welcome to the English philologist, whatever his attainments, since he here finds collected, under one point of view, what must else be sought through many volumes, and is nowhere to be found in equal fullness and clearness. All that is important in the utterances of Old English scholarship for the last ten years is summed up in its pages, and the compilation is enriched by a great number of particulars supplied by the author's own observation. Yet these particulars by no means represent Sievers' full share in the materials of the volume, many of its most noteworthy paragraphs being mere abridgments of his own articles in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*. In illustration of this fact it will be sufficient to compare the treatment of the *d*-, *jd*-, and *i*-stems, §§252, 256 and 262, with PB I 486-504; the syncope of medial vowels, §§143-8, with PB V 70-82; the succinct note on *cuman*, §390, Anm. 2, with PB VIII 80-9; and the statement regarding the instrumental, §237, Anm. 2, with PB VIII 324-33.

Not only is there a notable accumulation of facts, but they have been

arranged in an orderly and perspicuous manner which leaves little to desire. The exceptions which will be noted further on scarcely detract from the pleasure with which the student greets this lucid exposition of a most difficult subject. In particular is this true of the chapters on the vowels, hitherto the most hopelessly perplexed of all the intricate webs which the student of Old English grammar was called upon to disentangle.

The system of cross-references adopted, while at first blush it seems unnecessarily minute, proves in the end to be a convenient guide through the mazes of phenomena presented by the vowels. No less helpful are the pages (13-22) at the beginning of chap. III. Here the Anglo-Saxon vowels are considered in their relation to those of the Germanic and West Germanic, the treatment being ranged under two heads: (1) The Vowel Systems of Germanic and West Germanic, and (2) The Correspondences of the West Germanic Vowels in West Saxon.

The quantity of the Anglo-Saxon vowels has here been rigorously observed, the authority of the manuscripts being accepted as paramount. Besides the introductory remarks in §8, the fluctuations of quantity are examined in §§120-5. Of these the most unaccountable are the prolongations of vowels followed by single consonants in monosyllabic words, though these are supported by the same evidence as similar prolongations before nasal + consonant or liquid + consonant.

The prominence given to the unstable *y* and *ȳ*, §§31-3, together with the remarks on the *i*-umlaut of *ea*, *ea*, *eo* and *eo*, §§97-100, are reassuring at the outset, since they seem to contain the explanation of a puzzling phenomenon; closer inspection shows, however, that the difficulty is only shifted to other ground, remaining at last as inexplicable as before. Perhaps Sweet's suggestion, *Pastoral Care*, p. xxvii (cf. pp. xxix and xxx), is the most satisfactory yet advanced; cf. also ten Brink in *Anglia*, I 518-19.

Intimately connected with the last is the paragraph on palatal umlaut, §101. Its effect, according to Sievers, consists chiefly in the transmutation of the *eo*, *io*, produced by breaking before *h* + consonant, into *ie*, which *ie* ultimately suffers change into *i* and *y*. The discovery was made by Paul, who (*Beiträge*, VI 46-7) first called attention to the phenomenon, and provided the explanation, though he probably owed something to Möller, *Die Palatalreihe der Indogermanischen Grundsprache im Germanischen*, pp. 56-7.

The *i*-umlaut of short *o*, §93, deserves a passing notice. Sievers shows that the true umlaut of *o* is *e*. His theory is based upon Paul, *Beiträge*, VI 242, with which may be compared Cosijn, *Kurzgefasste Altwestsächsische Grammatik*, p. 36, D; for the older view regarding *ele* see Sweet, *P. C.* p. 491, though this explanation is modified in *Anglia*, III 157.

The plan of this book is essentially that of Braune's *Gothic Grammar*, *i. e.* the two exhibit the kind and amount of similarity which would naturally be expected between two grammars emanating from the same school. Braune had, however, the advantage of dealing with a much less complicated subject, and hence is not obliged to resort to long and frequent digressions. From the very nature of the case it is impossible for Sievers to attain equal symmetry in the disposition of his materials. The vowel system of Old English being extremely complicated, and the plan of the book including some account of



dialectic variations in the language, many of the inequalities to be noticed would seem to be unavoidable. Others may be explained from the fact that the grammar has grown by accretion from a set of University lectures. Sievers himself says in the preface: "Der kurze abriß, den ich jetzt der Öffentlichkeit übergebe, macht demgemäß nicht den anspruch, mehr zu sein, als eine solche überarbeitung, obwohl über der umschriß und durchsicht manches ergänzend hinzugetreten ist, was der ursprünglichen fassung fremd war." Accordingly, the book is neither a mere outline of West Saxon grammar, containing only the essentials, nor an exhaustive treatise, discussing the various dialects in full. It is rather a compromise between the two, with a distinct leaning toward the original plan of the series, which is that of compendious manuals.

This conception might have been more strictly carried out, without material detriment to the value of the book, and with a decided gain as regards symmetry of execution and unity of impression. Such details, for example, as are introduced in §271, Anm. 2, §285, Anm. 2, and §374, Anm. are rather lexical than grammatical, and will be more welcome to specialists than to the great body of the students for whom the book, or at least the series, is designed. Who constitute the latter class may be learned from the preface to Braune's Gothic Grammar, which closes with these words: "Diese grammatiken sollen gedrängte, jedoch nicht zu dürftige darstellungen bieten und besonders anhängern zur einföhrung in das philologische studium der betreffenden sprachstufe dienen."

A number of misprints and minor errors have been noted, but they are hardly serious enough to occasion the student much difficulty, and will no doubt be corrected in a second edition.

ALBERT S. COOK.

---

Archia. Texte Latin publié d'après les travaux nouvelle collation du Gemblacensis, un commentaire introduction et un index par ÉMILE THOMAS.  
 . 63 pp.

poet Archias is not, as Tacitus says, one of the great, and although in point of argument it is far less, it has a great charm for scholars and book-lovers, and is a literature the world lives. The present attractive form, with a good introduction stating the life of Archias, reviewing briefly the attacks on the genuineness of the speech, with a refutation of the sources of the text, and an analysis of the oration, and the editor shows a much greater familiarity with scholarship than was formerly common in Germany. Seyffert, Merguet and Mueller are not. The editor has preserved an independence of judgment: he keeps *inreperunt* of the MSS against Baiter's *reperunt*, and explains thus, making the idea of time *d'étrangers ont pénétré dans les villes italiennes, droits frauduleusement acquis, repoussera-t-on*

Archias?" In the same section he makes the mistake of referring *civitate* to the Roman franchise; the franchise of Heraclia is meant, as the context shows. In §19 the note on *suum*, which is omitted by some editors, is not full enough; the preceding *dicunt suum* conditions the use of *suum* here, for which Cic. De Rep. I 27 uses *pro suis vindicare* and elsewhere *sibi vindicare*. The orthography of the edition is not as good as one might reasonably expect. Not to speak of the genitives in *-ii* which are kept throughout, a point where there is room for hesitation, one is pained to find *inficior* (immediately before *confiteor*), *conditione*, *solatium*, *dampnationem*, *contempnenda*, and there is a certain inconsistency in reading §24 *innumerabilis copias* and in §31 *apud omnes*. It would be well, however, if all editions were as free from mistakes.

M. W.



## REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. VI.

No. 4. Nov.

1. Pp. 193-203. Critical remarks on Liv. XXIII-XXV, by O. Riemann. The author is preparing an edition of these books of Livy, and has made some emendations, 65 in all, which he here presents and discusses. The most of them, as he remarks, are not of great importance. I cite a few as samples. XXIII 5, 15: Nec Hannibal se vicisse sentiet nec Romani victos esse. Read: victos [*se*] esse. XXIV 6, 7: Himera amnis, qui ferme dividit insulam, etc. Read: ferme [*mediam*] dividit. XXV 28, 6: inopiam quaeque (P *quequae*) ipsi inter se fremere occulte soliti erant, conquesti. Read: inopia[*m alia*]que quae.

2. Pp. 203-4. L. Havet discusses Quintil. I, I, 24. For *etiam brevia* the Ambrosianus has *ei \*iniorevia*, which is for *ei* and *via* with something like *meliore* between, and no doubt represents the true reading.

3. P. 204. O. Riemann suppresses *ἀν* before 'Ακαρνάνων in Thuc. II 80 as having grown out of a dittography of *ακ*.

4. P. 204. L. Havet expresses the opinion that Saturnian distichs were common at a certain period, and that the word *elogium*, i. e. *ἐλεγεῖον* (*distich*), thus originated.

5. Pp. 205-8. Book notices, chiefly by O. R.

6. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 225-337 (end). France (completed), Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Holland, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland.

Vol. VII. No. 1. Feb.

1. Pp. 1-5. On the exclamation *malum*, by Constant Martha. The author published an article on this subject in Vol. III, pp. 19-25, maintaining that *malum* as an exclamation always denoted impatience at some sort of folly. (See this Journal, No. 1, p. 84). This view was questioned by E. P. Morris in this Journal, No. 10, pp. 208 ff. M. Martha writes the present article for the purpose of making known to the readers of the *Revue* the new examples found by Mr. Morris, and of defending the views expressed in his first article.

2. Pp. 5-6. Ten passages of Pomponius Mela emended by L. Havet.

3. Pp. 7-12. On certain omissions in the text of Demosthenes, by Henri Weil. Seven lacunae pointed out and filled. This article merits attention from students of Demosthenes.

4. Pp. 13-22. On a Latin grammar in a MS of the eighth (?) century belonging to the library of Nancy, by A. Collignon. This grammar, or *Glosa de partibus orationis*, is composed of a series of extracts from ancient grammarians without much system. Sometimes the author is given, but in many cases this is neglected. The chief value of the work consists in the fact that it contains

a considerable number of hitherto unknown passages of the grammarian Virgilius Maro. [In one of these the question whether the nominative can properly be called a case or not is discussed and decided affirmatively. The subject is viewed, however, from a standpoint very different from that of modern grammarians.]

5. P. 22. L. Havet emends a verse of Naevius (Nonius, ed. Quicherat, p. 159 M., 6): put *cum* before *sis*.

6. P. 22. In Xen. Resp. Lac. 2, 6, O. Riemann proposes *καὶ εἰς* [τὸ εἰς] *μῆκος* [ἀν] *αὐξάνεσθαι* κτέ.

7. Pp. 23-32. On the Paris MSS of the Distichs of Cato, by Max Bonnet. The only edition of Cato (F. Hauthal, Berlin, 1870) that pretends to make any use of the Paris MSS is exceedingly unreliable. H. J. Müller called attention to this fact in 1876, and in the same year the *Revue Critique* (II, p. 187) exposed the carelessness of Hauthal. But these warnings were fruitless, as is shown by the most recent edition (*Poetae Latini minores*, ed. Aem. Baehrens, vol. III, Lipsiae, 1881). Bonnet examines and classifies the MSS in question, comparing them with others, and discusses a considerable number of passages, taking occasion to investigate some metrical and grammatical points.

8. Pp. 33-60. Criticism of Greek texts at the École des Hautes Études (Continuation. See this Journal, No. 12, p. 491.) II. Demosthenes. Y. discusses *καὶ γάρ τοι* and submits 43 emendations. 1. Y. shows that *καὶ γάρ τοι* is not a quasi-synonym of *καὶ γάρ*, but rather of *τοιγάροι* (*itaque*). One difficulty (p. 358, ch. 56) he proposes to remove by emendation (*καὶ γὰρ* [οὐ] *τοι*, or something of the sort). 2. The emendations, though rarely convincing, all merit attention.

9. P. 60. Y. calls attention to the fact that in Dobree's *Adversaria* on Soph. Trachin. 574 we find "aenigma *Sophocle* dignum," for which Y. wishes to read '*sphinge* dignum.'

10. Pp. 61-64. Seven passages of L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum, Lib. I, discussed and emended by J. van der Vliet.

11. P. 64. For *excoluisse* in Martial, Epigr. VI 52, 4, Henri Le Foyer proposes *expoliisse*, which he finds on the margin of a *variorum* edition.

12. P. 64. In Prudentius, Cathemerinon 2, 12, E. C. restores *pallescet* for *palescit* from a good MS.

13. Pp. 65-77. Emile Chatelain publishes a work entitled *Exempla diversorum auctorum*, contained in a Vatican MS (Reginensis 215) of the ninth century, and, in abridged form, in a MS (4883 A) of the tenth century in the national library of Paris. It contains a list of 250 verses selected from different poets for the purpose of illustrating quantity in various words. In Reginensis 215 the words illustrated are written opposite the verses in which they occur, and are provided with quantity marks. In most instances the author is given, but this is so often erroneously done that no confidence can be placed in the assignment of verses not otherwise known to us. The examples are evidently taken, not from the texts of the authors cited, but from grammarians and from anthologies now lost. A supposed "interim," for instance, is illustrated thus: "Inv.: Interim veteres laudat lasciva patronos," which should be: "Martial.

(V 34, 7): inter tam veteres ludat l. p." Chatelain has succeeded in assigning all the verses except about twenty to their authors. Some of the twenty are barbarous.

14. Pp. 78-81. Remarks on certain passages of the *Libellus pro synodo* of Ennodius, by L. Duchesne. This author uses the inflated, affected style which we find in the *Opus Paschale* of Sedulius (see this Journal, No. 9, p. 115). Duchesne emends a few passages.

15. P. 81. Michel Bréal expresses the opinion that in Liv. III 33, 8 (with Döring's emendation, *est* for *esset*) *privatus* is equivalent to *reus*.

16. P. 82-94. Unpublished text of Domninus of Larissa on arithmetic, with translation and commentary, by Ch. Em. Ruelle and J. Dumontier. This work is devoted to the solution of a single problem—how to divide one fraction or "ratio" by another. The author, being unacquainted with the method of inverting the divisor and multiplying, resolves the dividend into two factors, one of which shall be equal to the divisor. This he does in four ways, one of which I give: To divide  $\frac{1}{3}$  by  $\frac{1}{4}$ . Let  $\frac{1}{3} = \frac{4}{12} = \frac{4}{3} \times \frac{1}{4}$ . But  $3:12::4:x = 16$ . Hence  $\frac{1}{3} = \frac{16}{3} \times \frac{1}{4}$ , and  $\frac{1}{3} \div \frac{1}{4} = \frac{16}{3} = \frac{5}{3}$ . In the original, of course, no equations are written. Diagrams, however, are used; but they seem to have been added by some one else, for the text does not mention them.

17. Pp. 94-96. Note on a MS of Bourges containing Cicero's Letters, by E. Chatelain. This note demonstrates the worthlessness of the MS in question, and is published for the purpose of saving others a useless journey to Bourges.

18. Pp. 97-101. Note on two MSS of the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*, by O. Riemann. Among the many MSS of this romance, two of the thirteenth century, now in Rome, have a common text which is totally different from that of the other MSS. They present a developed text which in places is a literary improvement. I give a sample. Ordinary text (ch. 32): "Et cum puella Deum deprecaretur, subito piratae apparuerunt." The two MSS (M R): "Puella levavit manus et ait: Pater Apolloni, si vivis, vale, et sancta desideria, valete. Et dum hec diutius loquitur, supervenerunt pirate." Riemann collates a few chapters.

19. P. 102. L. Havet gives a new metrical division of a verse of Naevius (Nonius, 486, 27), and emends Statius, *Achil.* 1, 73 (*imum* for *unum*).

20. Pp. 103-12. Book notices, chiefly by the editors.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PÄDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN U. MASIUS. 1881.

VIII-IX.

85. pp. 513-33. Review by W. Clemm of Meyer's *Griechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1880. A connected, scientific presentation of the subjects pertaining to Greek grammar was lacking. Kühner's work was a dozen years old, and when it appeared was not up with the times. Only one class of the forms had been treated—the verb, by Curtius. The other systems of inflections as

well as phonology needed a new discussion which would use all the material which had been gathered. So we were all ready to welcome the work of Meyer. He takes the newest hypotheses as his starting-point. In this he is a little intemperate. Sometimes he is not ready to retain the old view even where the new view offers no more plausible explanations. As long as no strong root-forms are shown for *ἀπό, ἀνά, ἀνθος, ἄλλος*, etc., the reviewer does not share the author's prejudice against *ǎ* where it is not a weak form of *ā*. He considers *δγκ-νω* to be quite unsupported, and thinks the root *δακ* as possible as *αγ* and *αρχ*. He believes Meyer to be unjust toward sporadic changes. *κίδναται* and *σκίδναται* cannot be explained as dialectic variations. Meyer's view of final *σ* in adverbs like *καλῶς* (that it is brought by analogy from *ἐξ, ἐκτός*, etc.) is not so probable as that of Curtius (that *-ως = -āτ*). A chapter on the use and force of the accent is needed. The work, then, gives us a skilfully arranged view of Greek grammar according to the latest theories and based on extensive material. It does not, however, give the reasons for the views which are expressed, nor a complete and reliable repertorium of the facts of the language.

(76.) pp. 534-36. G. H. Müller in Soph. Trach. 651 reads *χρόνον παλαιόν* for *χ. πελάγιον*, comparing Soph. O. T. 561, Ajax 600, Phil. 493. In Trach. 958 for *μοῖνον* he reads *μῶλυν* ('weak,' 'exhausted,' cf. Nicand. Ther. 32) to give the desired contrast to *ἄλκιμον*. In Ant. 351 for *ἐξεται* he reads *ἐθίζεται*, construed with two accusatives on the analogy of *παιδεύω*, etc.

In Soph. El. 1394, J. Golisch reads *οῖμα* for *αῖμα*, comparing Hom. Π 752.

86. pp. 537-42. H. Stadtmüller offers conjectural emendations to the Homeric hymn to Hermes, *μύων* for *μῆ ἰδών*, 92; *ἀρδευθείσας* for *ἀθρόας οὔσας*, 106, to introduce a reference to the watering as well as the feeding of the cattle; similarly *ἀρδμούς* for *ἀγροίς*, 399, cf. Σ 521; *βιβὰς ποσὶ πυρπαλάμησεν* for *βιβᾶ, ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισιν*, 225, cf. 357; *κέντρων* for *κέρτομον*, 336 (cf. Ar. Clouds 444 and the scholion *κέντρων λέγεται καὶ ὁ κλέπτης*); *οὐρανόν* for *κραίνων* 425; *σπυρθίζων* for *σπουδῇ ἰών*, 305, cf. Photius *σπυρθίζειν· σφαδάζειν*, etc.; *ὑλακτῶν* for *ἀκυίων*, 280; *ἀνέφηνας* for *μέμηλας*, 437; *ὑπ' ὁμοκλῆς* for *ὑπὸ πολλῆς*, 373; *ἔσπετο* for *ἐπλετο*, 117, cf. 426, 440; *ἐνιπήν*, for *ἐαυτόν*, 239, cf. Δ 402, κ 448, ε 446, etc.

(64.) p. 542. R. Dressler in Stobaeus Anth. CXX 27 reads *θ α ν ἄ τ ω γὰρ γίγνεται διάλυσιν καμόντος σώματος τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ π η ρ ω θ έ ν τ ο ς κτλ*

87. pp. 543-52. K. von Jan defends his view (Jahrb. 1879, pp. 577 fg., see Am. Jour. Phil. I 373, II 531) that the Greek flutists regularly played two flutes (oboes) at the same time, one flute giving the melody, the other accompanying it on a higher note which was probably like that in the modern Greek churches, merely the keynote, dominant, or sub-dominant. The use of the two flutes is shown by the Greek vases which bear scenes of banquets, etc. In the museum at Munich a double flute is represented on 20 vases with black figures, and on 37 with red figures. On one side of another vase is a satyr with a flute in each hand; on the other side is a satyr with a single flute in the left hand, but the position of the right hand indicates that he has thrown the other flute into the air. If this one example be granted, then the Munich vase collection contains 59 examples of the double flute and not one of the single flute.

If the two flutes were customary at banquets, doubtless they were at concerts, where the music would be more elaborate.

That the two flutes sounded different notes is indicated most clearly by the words of Aristoxenus in Plutarch *de mus.* 36 ὑποκρίνει γὰρ ἂν τις ἀκούων αἰλητοῦ πότερον ποτε συμφωνοῖσιν οἱ αὐλοὶ ἢ οὐ, in connection with the definition of Pseudo-Euclid *de mus.* 8 σύμφωνα μὲν οὖν [διαστήματα] ἐστὶ διὰ τεσσάρων, διὰ πέντε, κτλ., and ἐστὶ δὲ συμφωνία μὲν κρᾶσις δύο φθόγγων ὀξυτέρου καὶ βαρυτέρου.

88. pp. 553-61. J. S. Kroschel on the Νέφελεντικόν in the oldest MSS of Plato. Greek grammarians assert that Attic prose-writers used this *ν* in the dat. plur in -σι, the 3 pers. sing. in -ε, and verbs ending in -σι, no matter whether consonant or vowel followed, and that to this statement μαρτυρεῖ πᾶσα βίβλος. We must then believe that this was the custom in the MSS used by these grammarians; but that the Athenians in the time of their earliest prose-writings did not regard the *ν* as a fixed element of the endings is shown by the usage of Aristophanes, who has always been considered a model of Attic style. He prefers the *ν* ἐφ. to elision, but avoids it before consonants as far as he can, except where he introduces old-fashioned forms like τοῖσιν, μαθηταῖσιν, etc. He uses it before consonants only about once in 50 verses, most frequently in ἐστίν. But the copyist changed even the words of poets by attaching the *ν*. So in Eur. Andr. 275 ἦλθ' was changed to ἦλθεν, Hel. 316 ἔλεξ' to ἔλεξεν. Probably the final vowel was written in the copy and ἦλθε ὁ τόκος seemed obviously wrong. In poetry we are generally able to detect such insertions by the metre.

In Plato the wearisome repetition of the forms with *ν* is due mainly to the codex Clarkianus. This codex is compared by Kroschel with the codex Venetus which was written in the XII century. The independence of the latter is shown and that its readings have not been corrupted by conjectures. It is thought that the sources of these two codices were divided before the V century. Since the Ven. gives in many points the older tradition, it deserves more weight than the Clarkianus. This would remove the *ν* from at least half the cases. It is noticeable that in the dialogues of the first tetralogy, a "second hand" (conjectured by Kroschel to be Arethas himself) has erased a large proportion of the unnecessary cases of *ν*. It is possible that the MS from which the Clark. was copied had many abbreviations and used the same mark for ἐστί and ἐστίν. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that ἐστ' no longer appears in the MS and ἐσθ' only rarely. Moreover, in the Platonic MSS this *ν* is wrongly inserted in the quotations from Pindar, Simonides, and Euripides. In this connection Kroschel conjectures in the ode of Simonides quoted Prot. 346 d, that the original was ἐπεὶ οὐτιν', etc., (for ἐπειθ' ὑμῖν εὐρών where Bergk now reads ἐπὶ τ' ὑμῖν), comparing the gnome ascribed to Simon. Amorg. πᾶμπαν δ' ἄμωμος οὐτις οὐδ' ἀκήριος.

89. pp. 561-64. K. J. Liebhold in Plato's Parmenides 135 d for ἐλκυσσιν δὲ σαντὸν καὶ γύμνασαι reads ἐκλυσσιν κτλ.; in 160 d he inserts οἷόν τε between γινώσκεισθαι and ὅταν. In 164 a for οὔτε ταῦτ' αὐτῷ ἑτέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ he reads οὔτε ταῦτ' αὐτῷ οὐδ' ἑτέρα ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ μὴ ὄντος). In Gorgias 500 c he omits οὐ before τί ἂν μᾶλλον and ἐπὶ before τόνδε τὸν βίον. In 501 a he reads ἡ δ' ἑτέρα τῆς ἡδονῆς πρὸς ἣν ἡ θεραπεία αὐτῇ ἐστὶν ἅπασα, οὔτε τι τὴν φύσιν σκεψαμένη οὔτε

ἡτέριως ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐρχεται ἀλόγως κτλ. In 503 c, τοῦτο δὲ τέχνη for εἶναι. In 513 b, to form the desired contrast with τῷ λόγῳ τῷ λόγῳ is suggested for λεγομένων τῶν λόγων. In 513 γδοιὴν ὁμιλεῖν is illustrated by 521 a, Phaedrus 272 d, Laws 317 d. In 513 e it is suggested that σκοπεῖ may have been a copyist after δ θεραπεύομεν.

565-68. Critical notes of H. Marquardt on Galen περὶ ψυχῆς

569-592. A notice by F. Hultsch of Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Mathematik von M. Cantor. I. Leipzig, 1880. The book is of interest and instruction. The treatment of the decimal and sexagesimal systems is commended and amplified. The Hebrews like the Egyptians followed the decimal system; cf. the tithes of the Mosaic legislation, the divisions of the tabernacle, and the report of the temple of Solomon, in 1 Kings 6 of Chronicles. In this last, however, as in the (post-exilian?) description of Noah's ark and in the vision of Ezekiel, we see also the influence of the Babylonian system. But the 300, 60, 30 ells became decimal at once when referred to their value in Hebrew rods. So the Babylonian measure of 360 becomes the Greek stade of 600 feet or 100 ὀργυιαί. So the superficial measure was 100 ft. square. The Greeks took from Babylon their geometry as it pertained to astronomy.

92. pp. 593-637. An elaborate discussion of the *templa* of the augurs by P. Regell, intended to serve as a sort of supplement to Nissen's work on the *templum*. Much confusion has prevailed because the different *templa* were not distinguished. A comparison of the various statements of the ancients shows that while the augur turned to the south for the observation of the lightning, he generally turned towards the east to observe the flight of birds. In Livy I 18 (the inauguration of Numa) the clause *dextras ad meridiem partes, laevas ad septentrionem esse dixit* [originally *dicit*] is thought to be an interpolation from an old marginal note. Livy would have used the technical *sinistras*, not *laevas*, and the *templum* in question is the whole heaven, thus for the observation of lightning and not of birds, as Romulus was declared king by lightning on the left. At the close of the article the Umbrian *templum* is discussed in opposition to the views both of Bréal and Kirchhoff. The discussion, which is accompanied by figures and full quotations from the monuments, cannot be condensed to a brief statement.

93. pp. 637-40. K. P. Schulze criticises *Die Elegien des Tibullus erklärt von Fabricius*. Berlin, 1881. The edition evidently is intended for *dilettanti* of whom the editor is one. He has followed Bachrens blindly in spite of all warnings and has allowed important works to escape him. Schulze in the main commends F. Leo's treatment of some elegies of Tibullus in Kiessling and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's *Philolog. Untersuchungen* II. Leo endeavors to follow in the path opened by Vahlen (Berlin Acad. 1878). He is successful in his characterisation of the poet and in tracing the development of thought in the first six elegies of the first book.

94. pp. 641-50. R. Klussmann criticises Engelmann's *Bibliotheca Script. Classicorum* 8th ed. I, 1880. Philology had a right to demand more careful

revision of the work. The editor needs a more intimate than usual acquaintance with the history of Greek and Roman literature, combined with perfect familiarity with the *βρομαστικόν* of philology and long years of training in the book trade. Thus Preuss, the editor of this revision, catalogues books which do not exist, does not distinguish properly between homonymous writers, and does not give with sufficient care the particulars, if an article has been republished.

95. pp. 650-52. C. Frick holds that *ὁ χωρογραφικὸς πίναξ*, Strabo II 5, 17, does not refer, as has been thought of late, to the map of the world which was prepared by Augustus. The article is generic, used to denote the whole class of maps. The adjective differs from *γεωγραφικός* only as including the details (*ποικίλματα*) of the situation of cities, nations, etc.

(57.) pp. 652-55. A. Döring on Horace, Car. I 6. Kiessling, in *Philolog. Untersuch.* II, 1881, endeavors to save the generally condemned fourth strophe (*quis Martem tunica lectum adamantina, etc.*, cf. *κεκορυθμένος αἰθονι χαλκῷ*) by assigning to these scenes from the Iliad a symbolical relation with the rest of the ode. Döring goes much farther. The strophe assumes Agrippa's perfect familiarity with the Iliad. He remembers who were put to flight by Diomed *opē Palladis*, Hom. E 330 fg., 850 fg. Ares and Aphrodite correspond to Antony and Cleopatra; thus a Homeric allusion is introduced which has a highly characteristic reference to the achievements of Octavian and Agrippa. In Meriones, Horace had in view Hom. N 298-305, where Idomeneus and Meriones are compared with Ares and his son Φόβος. With these now Octavian and Agrippa are compared.

In the last line of the ode, *non praeter solitum leves*, the negative belongs only to *praeter solitum* as a *litotes*, a strengthened *more solito*. The poet represents himself as a true Anacreontist.

## X.

96. pp. 657-70. Fr. Susemihl on the date of the composition of the Phaedrus of Plato. In the *Jahrbücher*, 1880, pp. 707 fg. (see *Am. Journ. Phil.* II 531) he had examined Usener's arguments in support of the view that the Phaedrus was written 403 or 402 B. C. Since then Wilamowitz-Möllendorff had entered the field with a series of new arguments for this view. Wilamowitz says that the Phaedrus is the program of the Platonic dialogue, a new branch of literature, and thus it is hardly conceivable that other dialogues should have preceded it. But, says Susemihl, how can a composition be a program of the age in which there is no express mention of the dialectic form for the cultivation of thought, and which is not itself a pure dialogue, but in which speeches are introduced? To regard this as a program of Plato's work would be as one-sided as to regard it as a program of his work as a writer. It is at least by no means a program of the *Socratic* dialogue. In it there is far from being a barren critic and intellectual midwife for other ideas. Krische held that the Phaedrus was composed during the lifetime of Socrates, and he strove to show that it presented a particularly faithful picture of the historic Socrates. Now the attempt is made to persuade us that the greatest deviation from truth in its representation of Plato's master is the argument for the early composition of the dialogue, even during his lifetime. But is it conceivable that years before Socrates's death, Plato, at the age



of twenty-four, from the standpoint of his own theory of ideas, should put on the mask of Socrates to announce to the world what and how he will teach, both in his writing and orally? The Phaedrus is indeed a program, but a program of Plato's metaphysics and logic, of his dialectics and theory of ideas.

97. pp. 670-72. W. H. Roscher recognizes the hero Adristas (Paus. VIII 4. 1) as named from the art of weaving and preparing wool which Arcas learned from him. (For such names cf. *Δαίτων*, *Μάρτων*, *Κεράων*, cooks and butlers in Lacedaemon.) The name is derived from *ἀτριον* (Attic *ἡτριον*), which Curtius derives from the root *va*, 'weave.' *Ἀτριστής* then would be 'weaver.' For the *δ* for *τ* before *ρ* cf. *Ἀτρία* and *Ἀδρία*, *Ἀτραμύττιον* and *Ἀδραμύττιον*.

98. pp. 673-91. M. Müller offers linguistic and critical notes to Livy, Books XXIV-XXVI, a companion to his text edition in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana.

99. pp. 692-96. H. Rönsch on *cophinus* and *faenum*, Juvenal III 14, VI 542. In III 14, *quorum cophinus faenumque supellex* introduces the reader to the domestic life of the Jews who dwelt in the once sacred grove of Egeria. In VI the *Iudaea tremens* is represented as she leaves this home for her business. (*Interpres legum Solymarum*, as the teacher of the Mosaic law to the Roman women who were proselytes; *magna sacerdos arboris*, mockingly, in contrast with the *magnus sacerdos templi* of Jerusalem, since she dwelt in the grove; *summa fida internuntia caeli*, probably as held in higher esteem as prophets than the augurs.) The basket and hay were characteristic of the Jews as Jews, and the correct explanation is preserved in an old scholion to VI 542, according to which the basket was for the keeping warm of cooked food and hot water for the Sabbath. The hay served to protect it and keep in the heat. The rabbinical strictness in the observation of the Sabbath and the rules for the keeping of food warm are well known.

100. pp. 697-706. J. Beloch discusses the arrangement of the history of Timaeus. The work was divided into books by the author, and the number of books can be determined approximately. The history of Agathocles, covering 28 years, was narrated in five books, but this was the story of his own time, in which he naturally would be most interested and of which he would write with the most details. The century from the Athenian expedition cannot then have filled more than 15 or 20 books. It is known that he described the Attic war in his thirteenth book, so twelve books remain for the earliest history of the West. Thus to the death of Agathocles we get a general estimate of 35 to 40 books which agrees well with our citations, which go to book 38. The fragments are discussed and the conclusion reached that we can form a pretty satisfactory conception of the plan of the first half of the work, but from the seventeenth book to the end we have only six citations with the number of the book added. The following scheme is proposed for the work: I, till the capture of Troy 1334; II to Ol. I, 776; III-VI, Greek colonization of the West, to about Ol. L, 580; VII-IX, history of the West, to the time of Gelo, about Ol. L-LXX, 580-500; X, to the battle of Himera, Ol. LXX-LXXIV, 500-480; XI, to the overthrow of the Deinomenids, Ol. LXXV-LXXVII, 480-468; XII, the democracy to the Attic war, Ol. LXXVIII-LXXXVII, 468-428; XIII, Attic war, Ol. LXXXVIII-XCI, 428-412; XIV, first war with Carthage, Ol.



XCII, 412-408; XV, siege of Acragas, Ol. XCIII 1-2, 408-406; XVI-XXIV, Dionysius I and II, Ol. XCIII 3-CV, 405-356; XXV-XXVII, anarchy, Ol. CVI-CVIII, 356-344; XXVIII-XXX, Timoleon, Ol. CIX-CX, 344-336; XXXI-XXXIII, Oligarchy, Ol. CXI-CXIV, 336-320; XXXIV-XXXVIII, Agathocles, Ol. CXV-CXXII, 320-289; Appendix, Ol. CXXIII-CXXVIII, 288-264.

101. pp. 707-20. H. Peter commends warmly Ribbeck's life of Ritschl.

# XI.

102. pp. 721-31. M. Wohlrab defends himself against the charge brought by Schanz of critical incompetence in the treatment of the text of Plato.

103. pp. 732-39. Emendations to the text of Plato's Laws by K. J. Liebhold.

104. pp. 739-40. F. Blass queries whether we have a work by Simmias of Thebes in an anonymous treatise published by Stephanus in an appendix to his Diogenes Laertius (by Mullach, Frag. Phil. I 544) under the title 'Ἀνωνύμου τινὸς διαλέξεις Δορικῇ διαλέκτῳ. A reference to the disaster of Aigospotami as recent proves the date of the composition. From one passage the name of the author has been thought to be Μίμης. The treatise is identified by Blass with Nos. 5-11 of the works of Simmias as enumerated by Suidas.

105. pp. 741-48. E. Rohde, "Leucippus and Democritus once more." He inquires how it happened that Leucippus, who, according to Aristotle and Theophrastus, had developed the complete atomic theory, is not mentioned by Lucretius or Sextus Empiricus, or indeed by any one outside the circle of Aristotle and Theophrastus, while all the praise is heaped on the head of Democritus. It is unexampled in the history of Greek philosophy that the inventor of an original theory and founder of a school based thereon should have left no traces in the memory of his own school, and that Epicurus could deny that he had ever existed. Rohde thinks that certain works which were ascribed to Leucippus in the time of Aristotle were afterwards assigned to Democritus.

106. pp. 748-52. Critical notes by O. Schmidt on Xenophon's Hiero, II and VII.

107. p. 752. H. Röhl, in Kaibel, Epigr. Graeca 706 (Welcker, Syll. p. 91), would read, not Κίδωνος πλησίον, but κίδωνος (= κυδωνίου μῆλον) πλησίον.

108. pp. 753-63. H. Schweizer-Sidler praises Havet, de Saturnio Latinorum versu, Paris, 1880. "The book as a whole is so important, shows so much learning, thoroughness and acumen, is so instructive for the old Latin language and poetry, that slight criticisms upon it are not becoming."

(42.) pp. 763-65. Conjectural emendations by M. Hertz to Seneca rhetor, Apuleius, Fl. Vopiscus, Ammianus Marcellinus.

(57.) pp. 766-68. E. Hoffmann on Horace, Car. II 1, 4 fg. and 21, *uncta cruoribus* he considers unlatin (we should expect *uncta cruore*) and would read *functa cruoribus*. In v. 21 he would read *audere . . . video* for *audire . . . videor*.

109. pp. 769-83. J. Woltjer, *de archetypo quodam codice Lucretiano*. After an examination of the six books he comes to the conclusion "fuisse olim codicem, cuius paginae ternos denos versus continerent, hunc codicem parum accurate transcriptum fuisse, multis locis schedarum supremas et infimas partes

mutilatas et corruptas fuisse, vix ut legi possent, singulos autem versus dimidiatos fuisse, in binis lineis ut scripti essent, haud inepte contendere posse videtur, huic exemplari lector quidam et Lucretii arte et Epicuri philosophia satis imbutus suas adnotationes inseruit, versibus quibusdam comparationis causa alios adscripsit, aut ut poetam sibi ipsum contra dicere ostenderet, atque singulorum locorum argumenta paucis verbis, interdum ex Epicuro sumptis, expressa in margine adnotavit, qui codex cum deinde transcriberetur ab homine rudi et imperito, fieri non potuit quin multi versus e margine in contextum irrepererent et saepius in fine paginae adderentur."

110. pp. 783-84. K. Dziatzko, vs. 648, 649 of the Hecyra of Terence belong after 654.

111. pp. 785-801. E. Zarncke, on the so-called *vocabula Graecanica* in the titles of the odes of Horace; a supplement to his dissertation on the same subject (Strasburg, 1880), in which he had discussed these headings as found in the MSS. Here he treats of them as found in the old editions and finds his former conclusion confirmed, that they had been thrown overboard rightly, as useless pedantry of the schools of the rhetoricians.

112. pp. 802-04. J. H. Schmalz "notices" Theilmann über Sprache und Kritik des lateinischen Apolloniusromanes, 1881.

113. pp. 805-07. K. Welzhofer holds that the MS of Pliny which was bought by Cosimo de' Medici was not of the younger Pliny, as conjectured by Voigt, but was of the elder Pliny's works, probably cod. L.

(83.) pp. 807-08. Miscellaneous conjectures to Latin authors by K. E. Georges.

114. p. 808. W. H. Roscher reads *nactus* for *factus*, Vell. Paterculus II 17, 3.

## XII.

115. pp. 809-15. H. Stadtmüller. Conjectural emendations to the Homeric Hymns.

116. pp. 815-16. C. Cron on Plato's Gorgias corrects a view which Hertz had expressed and shows that in 521e the expression *ὅνπερ πρὸς Πῶλον ἔλεγον* is exact, since 463 fg. Socrates is continually aiming at Polus although in conversation with Gorgias.

117. pp. 817-23. H. Flach denies the Indogermanic origin of the Prometheus myth, asserts that it sprang up on Greek soil, and that the original meaning of the myth is made certain by the etymology of the Titan's name, which cannot be separated from *προμήθεια*, *προμηθής*, etc., and must be identified with *Πρόνοος*, whom the scholion on Thuc. I 3 names as the son of Deucalion. But in spite of the indications of Aesch. Prom. 85, 381, Pindar Ol. VII 44, Arist. Birds 1511, we are expected to swallow Kuhn's theory whole. Perhaps in this myth two originally distinct versions, one from Peloponnesus, the other from Lemnos, have become mingled. The connection of the Heracles myth with that of Prometheus is of subordinate importance. It is conjectured that at the bottom of the Prometheus story was the worship of a Pelasgian divinity whom the Greeks identified with various local heroes, as *Φορωνεύς* (perhaps the fire-thief), *Πρόνοος*, *Προμηθεύς*. The Aeschylean Prometheus as son of *Γαῖα* is *αὐτόχθων*, just as the Argive Phoroneus according to Acusilaus was the first man,

and the Lemnian Prometheus through his marriage with Hesione (*Ἀσίη*) was conceived as the progenitor of the human race just as Phoroneus at Argos.

118. pp. 823-24. An amphora in the Berlin Museum is declared by K. Wieseler to represent Heracles to the Greeks as a Scytho-Germanic god. Heracles, according to his view, was not Phoenician, but a German war and sun god; he went to Greece and there was changed into a hero. The name Heracles and the words on the vase are explained by the writer from the German.

119. pp. 825-31. F. Kern, Critical and exegetical notes to Soph. Ant. 392, 601, 1061 fg.

120. pp. 831-32. A. Lowinski. Conjectural emendations to Aesch. Sept. 10-13, to read *ἰμᾶς δὲ χρῆ νῦν, καὶ τὸν ἐλλείποντά τι | ἤβης ἀκμαίας, καὶ τὸν ἐξῆβον χρόνῳ | βλάστημ' ἐτ' ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πόλιν, | ἔραν τ' ἔχονθ' ἑκάστον, ὥσπερ οὖν πρέπει κτλ.*

121. pp. 833-38. H. Rumpf finds a remarkable example of the digamma on an inscription from the first century B. C., which was found near Sebastopol in the Chersonese Heracleia, and first published in 1880. *τὰ ἐνοῦα* is found in the sense of *τὰ ἱεροῦδα, vini libatione sancita*. Over the *o* stands *v* which cannot be taken as a correction for *oi*, since no trace of *v* for *oi* nor of *ov* for *v* is found in the inscription. That *v* was used sometimes as a representative of the digamma is shown by Curtius, Gzge. 564 fg., and it is to be remembered that peculiarities of this kind would be retained longer in the formulae of sacrifices than elsewhere.

122. pp. 839-40. W. H. Roscher in Caesar, Bell. civ. III 109, 5, would read *quorum alter accepto vulnere torpore (or rigore) occupatus per suos pro occiso sublatus, alter interfectus est*.

123. pp. 841-49. O. Wichmann justifies his view of Schwarz's work on the Demonax of Lucian, which was criticised in this volume of the Jahrbücher pp. 327 fg. by Ziegler, who disputed the disordered state of the Demonax. Wichmann endeavors to prove interpolations and other evidences of revision.

124. pp. 850-56. J. G. Cuno. Etruscan Studies: Tarquinius Priscus, Tullia, Tanaquil. The original story probably brought Tarquinius into connection with Corythus, a country, not the city Cortona as is often supposed. Corythus is the country which was promised to Aeneas. See Verg. 10, X 719. From Corythus to Corinthus was but a step, and thence arose that Tarquin's father was a Corinthian exile. *Priscus* must be the Latin name of the Etruscan Lucumo (cf. Livy I 34) which meant *rex*. He is not in contrast with L. Tarquinius Superbus; he would be *maior* in that sense. In Livy I 32, the *prisci Latini* are the citizens of Latium with full correspondence to the *populus Romanus Quiritium*. So also Servius has nothing to do with *servus*, but is a translation of the Etruscan Masnodification of the Latin *magister* with the suffix *-na*, which is very common in Etruscan. From Fabretti's Corpus Inscript. Corssen cites *macstru*, with *magister*. So Tanaquil is said to have received in Rome another name, *ecilia*. But this is only a translation of her other name. It is contrasted with the myths pertaining to these three persons were brought to Roman Italy by Etruscan conquerors and colonists, and were adopted there as so much of Etruscan civilization was adopted.

(18.) pp. 857-67. F. Hankel, the ancient Roman camp according to Polybius, a reply to Nissen's article, pp. 129 fg. of this volume of the *Jahrbücher*.

125. pp. 868-70. Ph. Thielmann commends Heerdegen's *Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Semasiologie*, speaking in detail of the use of *orare*.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

#### WEISKE ON THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE.

The pedagogical section of the *Jahrbücher*, which is edited by Professor Masius, does not fall within the scheme of these reports, although the articles are often of considerable interest, both theoretical and practical. In the volume for 1882 (pp. 494-504, 529-42) Dr. G. A. Weiske, of Halle, has undertaken to collect and arrange according to the categories of Koch's grammar, the articular infinitives occurring in Plato, Thukydides, Xenophon and the Attic orators. He has not gone into the matter of proportion as I have done, so that his paper does not serve to correct the results reached by my pupils and myself. See *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 1878, and *Am. Journ. of Phil.* III, 193-202. Nor has he noticed the occurrence of such rarities as the fut. articular inf. and the articular inf. with *άν*. The nominative infinitive he considers to have little grammatical interest, a point in which many will not agree with him, as the transition of the inf. from dat. to acc. and from acc. to nominative deserves the most careful study, and would have been furthered by a complete list. It is doubtless true, as Dr. Weiske says, that the development of the articular infinitive checked the development of the abstract substantive in Greek, but we must remember that abstract substantive and infinitive do not cover each other, and when we look over the complete list that Dr. Weiske gives of the articular accusative infinitives, we find that a very small percentage of the verbs cited have not a corresponding abstract substantive.

Of the advantages which the infinitive has over the abstract subst. I have written already, and I will not repeat here what is tolerably evident to any one who thinks on the subject. Dr. Weiske speaks of the 'leichtigkeit des satzbaues' attained by the use of the articular infinitive. If he means by 'leichtigkeit' 'compactness' I should agree with him, but I have shown sufficiently that the articular infinitive is really a norm of artificiality and that an excessive use of it toughens the style.<sup>1</sup> On the chapter of the use of the abstract substantive and the articular infinitive in combination, Dr. Weiske has touched but lightly. He says the articular inf. is often combined by means of *καί* with a preceding substantive in the same case, the infin. giving the narrower, the subst. the wider sense. This, he says, is especially common in Demosthenes. So 8, 12: *τὴν μὲν ἐχθραν καὶ τὸ βούλεσθαι κωλύειν*; 18, 296: *τὴν δ' ἐλευθερίαν καὶ μηδὲνα ἔχειν δεσπότην αὐτῶν*; 20, 45: *τὴν προθυμίαν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον ποιεῖν*; 57, 2: *τὸν καιρὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ παρωξύνθαι τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὰς ἀποφηφίσεις*. He might have added that this is in exact conformity with Demosthenes' way of working out a problem before his audience, who are

<sup>1</sup> Dionysios makes a similar remark about the excessive use of the gen. absol. in *Isaios* (*De Isae. Iud.* p. 598).

... as he feels his way to a just expression. The  
... without any regard to period or department or author,  
... need to be worked over again to get an historical

... the school grammar should enter under the accusa-  
... *ποιεῖν, δευγείν, φυλάττεσθαι, φοβεῖσθαι, καλεῖν, νομίζειν,*  
... reference 'as to'; under the genitive the complementary  
... *δυναμια, ἀδεια, ἀπειρία, δόξα, δύναμις, ἐθισμός, ἐξουσία,*  
... *ἐπιθυμια, τροφίσις, σημεῖον, τεκμήριον, φόβος* and *χρόνος*;  
... combined with the gen. of the art. inf. *αἰτιάσθαι*,—  
... *ἐπιθυμείν — ἀποστερεῖν, ἀπέχειν, ἀπαλλάττειν,*  
... the adjectives *αἰτιώσ, κύριος, ἄξιος*. He is right when he  
... comparison occurs frequently in the articular infinitive,  
... the recommendation of the gen. absol. which is a compar-  
... action, for reasons given, *Am. Jour. Phil. III 198*. The  
... *Thuk. 3, 2, 3; Lys. 12, 13; Isokr. 3, 6; 6, 3; Xen. Mem.*  
... *Mem. 285 E, Gorg. 509 E; Polit. 310 E; Kriton 49 D;*  
... *Mem. 5, 2; 20, 25; 23, 13; 25, 17; 61, 28*. Against these we  
... number of acc. participles with the simple infinitive, which  
... instruction. The dative art. inf. is far less common than the  
... of reasons (see *Am. Journ. of Phil. III 201*). The inf. is  
... the most important use is the dative of cause. Dr. Weiske  
... the combination with *ἐναντίος, διαφέρειν, χρῆσθαι*.  
... on prepositions with the articular infinitive is not without its  
... the plastic uses of the prepositions are excluded. There  
... is scarce enough, in prose, as it is), no *κατά* with the gen., no  
... (which has little scope in prose), no *ὑπέρ* with acc., no *περί* with dat. (which  
... at any rate), no *παρά* with gen. or dat.; *παρά* with acc. is rare.  
... have learned to exclude practically from model Attic prose, is  
... by W. from *Dem. 8, 65*: *μὴ σὺν εὐ πεπονθότων τῶν πολλῶν Ὀλυν-*  
... *συνεπτοῖσθαι*, but *σὺν εὐ πεπονθότων* is a rude quasi-compound  
... and the dative depends on the totality.

B. L. G.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*Sir*: I ask a little space for reply to some of the criticisms in a review of my translation of "Beowulf" contained in No. 13 of your Journal. For the generally favorable opinion expressed and for some of the bibliographical references I am much obliged, but, without going into details, I may say that I do not think it necessary to include in the bibliography of a work every book that in any way makes reference to it. As to the difficulties of Anglo-Saxon inversion for the general reader, they are sufficiently commented on in my preface, and as to the *Unwörter* charged, none are specified, and I do not think that any words used would be unintelligible to the general reader except the dozen or so for which a glossary is given.

The reviewer would seem to require that a line-for-line translation, which tries to preserve two accents to the half-line, should follow the principle of the Revisers of 1611 rather than that of the Revisers of 1881, as he objects to "the perpetual recurrence of such words as 'victorious,' 'jewel,' 'treasure,'" and thinks "a subtler insight would have perceived picturesque shades of meaning." When it is recollected that of *sige* and *sigor* = "victory," there are over a dozen compounds, of *sinc* = "jewel" or "treasure," at least six, of *máðum* = "jewel" no less than fourteen, and of *hord* = "treasure," about twelve, besides the "perpetual recurrence" of these words by themselves, I think the "subtler insight" would have been overburdened, and it were better to decline the attempt to find "picturesque shades of meaning."

I cannot notice each one of the *thirty-five* references in which, for one reason or another, exception is taken, and in some of which I concede that the correction is more exact than the word or phrase used; but many of them touch very small points, often silently passed over in Heyne's translation (which, being in ten-syllable iambic measure, is much freer), some are due to the failure to use Grein's text, the one translated, in the comparison instead of Heyne's, and others are inadmissible.

Some examples of each of these will be given: (1) Exception is taken to the omission of the particle *hæru* in 182 and 369. This important word = *saltem*, *quidem*, *certe*, γέ, and is omitted entirely by Heyne in both passages. I find that I have translated it "now," "indeed," in *seven* other passages, but while my translation professes to be line-for-line, it does not profess to be word-for-word, and I should not have considered it much of a blemish if I had omitted it in all of them. In one of these, 862, where I have "now," the reviewer corrects to "nevertheless," Heyne's glossary giving *doch*, *jedoch* for this reference. Let us substitute it and read the line:

"They did not *nevertheless* at all their dear lord blame" (!)

Surely some license in particles may be allowed to even a line-for-line translator.

This is the only passage in which I follow Heyne's explanation in text and relegate Grein's to the notes. Heyne has in glossary "*incge lāfe*, mit dem kostbaren Schwerte? oder mit wuchtigem Schwerte?" and in his translation "mit dem wuchtigen Stahl," hence "weighty" would have been better than "mighty." Grein follows Thorpe in taking *incge* as a proper name = Ing, King of the Danes, but then we must read *Incge[s]* with Thorpe, who says: "My interpretation is quite conjectural, the word *incge* being unknown to me," and he translates "with Inge's relic." Arnold, too, follows Thorpe, translating "with the Dane's (?) bequest," but says: "No one has suggested an explanation for *incge*." The reviewer suggests "with the *edge* of the sword," to which translation there would be no objection *if* there was any authority for the reading, but the scribe uses *ecge* in the same line and might easily have written *ecge* here, if that were the reading, and Holder gives plainly *inc ge lafe* (p. 59, 187a, l. 11), so that *ecge* must be rejected, and *incge* still awaits a satisfactory explanation. T.-B. has not yet reached the word. Heyne suggests a connection with *icge gold*, 1107, = "Schatzgold, reiches Gold?" but that word is equally as unknown. Wackerbarth translates "And with his mighty Relic Brand." Ettmüller follows Thorpe and Grein.<sup>1</sup>

To shorten this reply, I notice lastly only 2820, *dōm* = "doom," which translation might be "ambiguous" if the context did not show plainly what was meant, but it is certainly literal. It means here, of course, "heavenly glory." "Herlichkeit" (Grein and Heyne), "doom of the just" (Thorpe), "doom of the soothfast" (Arnold), but it does *not* mean "realm," nor will any support for this rendering be found in T.-B., q. v., s. v. III, p. 207, where "numerous references" for *dōm* = "glory" may be found.

I am obliged for some of the references, as they will enable me to supply further notes, but I am glad that the philological microscope, even when of strong magnifying power, has been able to detect so few "inaccuracies."

JAMES M. GARNETT.

<sup>1</sup> If the lists are still open, I would suggest *inc-gelāfe* (cf. *maðkam-sword*, 1023), alliterating with *seo*, which alliteration, although rare, is still admissible; *s* at beginning of the MS line might have been dropped as readily as after *ge* within the line. The facsimile of the Beowulf MS., just published by the Early English Text Society, reads *incgelāfe*, apparently as one word. Thorkelin printed *inc gelāfe*, but misinterpreted the passage; Grundtvig, *incgelāfe*, but suggests *Ingwina lāfe*? Kemble says in glossary, s. v. *lāf*, "*incge-lāf*, enals. I cannot explain the first word, and believe it to be a corruption of *icge-lāf*," and he gives "*icge* f veg-," with 1107 as the sole reference. The conjecture has, at least, the *f* intelligible.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Horace, *Horati Flacci Opera*, Parch. L. *Appleton*. \$1.25.  
*Xenophontis libri Socratici*. *Harper*. 50c.; pap. 32c.

### BRITISH.

*Æschylus*. *Suppliant Maidens*, translated into English verse by E. D. A. Morshead. Post 8vo, pp. 60. *Paul, Trench & Co.* 3s. 6d.

Bentley (Richard). *Dissertations on the Epistles of Phalaris*, etc. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by the late W. Wagner. (Bohn's Classical Library.) 12mo, pp. 620. *Bell & Sons*. 5s.

Demosthenes. *First Philippic*. With an Introduction and Notes. Ed. after C. Rehdantz, by Rev. T. Gwatkin. 12mo, pp. 104. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Evans (George). *An Essay on Assyriology*. Published for the Hibbert Trustees. 8vo, with 4to tables of Assyrian inscriptions. *Williams & Nor-gate*. 5s.

Frankfurter (Dr. O.) *Handbook of Pali: being an Elementary Grammar, a Chrestomathy, and a Glossary*. 8vo. *Williams & Co.* 16s.

Gardner (P.) *The Types of Greek Coins: an Archæological Essay*. Folio, pp. 350. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 31s. 6d.

Geddes (W. D.) *Flosculi Græci Boreales; sive Anthologia Græca Aberdonensis*. 8vo, pp. 264. *Macmillan*. 6s.

Geldart (E. M.) *Simplified Grammar of Modern Greek*. Post 8vo, pp. 66. *Trübner*. 2s. 6d.

— *A Guide to Modern Greek*. Post 8vo, pp. 286. *Trübner*. 7s. 6d.; Key, 2s. 6d.

Livy. Books 21–25. *The Second Punic War*. Translated into English, with Notes, by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb. With maps. Post 8vo, pp. 370. *Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.

*Persian Wit and Humour: being the 6th Book of the Baharistan of Jâmi*. Trans., for the first time, from the original Persian into English prose and verse, with Notes, by C. E. Wilson. Crown 8vo, pp. vii, 40. *Chatto & Windus*.

Plato. *Theætetus*. With a Revised Text and English Notes by Lewis Campbell. 2d ed. 8vo, pp. 296. *Frowde*. 10s. 6d.

Rockhill (W. W.) *Udanavarga; a Collection of Verses from the Buddhist Canon*, compiled by Dharmatrûta, being the Northern Buddhist version of *Dhammapada*, Translated from the Tibetan of the Bkah-hypur, with Notes



and Extracts from the Commentary of Prudīnavarman. (Trübner's Oriental Series). 8vo, pp. 232. *Trübner*. 9s.

Sophocles. Seven Plays. In English verse by Lewis Campbell. Post 8vo. pp. 422. *Paul, Trench & Co.* 7s. 6d.

Vinaya Pitakam, one of the principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pali language. Edited by Dr. H. Oldenberg. Vol. 5, The Parivara, and Indices. 8vo. *Orient. Library*. 21s.; Complete in 5 vols., £5 5s.

#### DANISH.

Soronsen (S.) Om Mahābhārata's Stilling i den indiske Literature. I. Forsøg paa at udskille de ældste Bestanddele. *Kjøbenhavn*, 1883. 8vo, 392 pp. 12m.

#### FRENCH.

Arbois de Jubainville (H. d'). Introduction à l'étude de la littérature celtique. In-8. *Thorin*. 8 fr.

Bréton (G.) Essai sur la poésie philosophique en Grèce: Xénophane, Parménide, Empédocle. In-8. *Hachette*. 5 fr.

Chabas (F.) Choix de textes égyptiens. Traductions inédites de François Chabas, publiées par P. J. de Horrack. Gr. in-8. *Klincksieck*. 6 fr. 50.

Chodzko (A.) Grammaire de la langue persane. 2 éd. augmentée de textes persans inédits et d'un glossaire. In-12. *Maisonneuve*. La 1<sup>re</sup> édition est de 1852. Cart., 10 fr.

Guyard (S.) Le Divan de Beha Ed-Din Zoheir. Variantes au texte arabe. In-12. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.

— Mélanges d'assyriologie. Notes de lexicographie assyrienne, suivies d'une étude sur les inscriptions de Van. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 5 fr.

Joret (C.) Des caractères et de l'extension du patois normand. Étude de phonétique et d'ethnographie. In-8. *Vieweg*. 6 fr.

Regnaud (P.) Nouveaux aperçus sur le vocabulisme indo-européen, précédés d'une analyse critique des systèmes actuellement en vigueur. Gr. in-8. *Vieweg*. 1 fr. 50.

Les incunables orientaux et les impressions orientales au  
du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Rapport sur une mission en Bavière et en Wur-  
temberg. *Maisonneuve*. 6 fr.

#### GERMAN.

Die Kunde d. Morgenlandes, hrsg. v. der Deutschen Mor-  
schenschaft unter der Red. d. Prof. Dr. E. Windisch. 8 Bd. Nr. 2.  
*Brockhaus' Sort in Comm.* Inhalt: Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes  
ina. 1 Thl. Einleitung, Text u. Glossar. Von Dr. Ernst Leu-  
n. 6.

G.) Üb. deutsche Volksetymologie. 4, stark verm. Aufl. gr.  
Heilbronn, *Henninger*. n. 5.

Bedeutung u. Gebrauch v. δα bei Homer. Inaugural-Disser-  
tion. München, *Stahl*. n. 1, 50.

Die attischen Diasien. Ein Beitrag zur griech. Heortologie.  
Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Berger (F.) Üb. die Heerstrassen d. römischen Reiches. II. Die Meilensteine. gr. 4, 21 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. (à) n. 1.

Bezold (C.) Die Schatzhöhle, syrisch u. deutsch hrsg. 1 Tl. A. u. d. T.: Die Schatzhöhle, aus dem syr. Texte dreier unedirten Handschriften in's Deutsche übers. u. m. Anmerkgn. versehen. gr. 8, xi, 82 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n.n. 8.

Blass (F.) De Gemino et Posidonio. gr. 4, 25 S. Kiel, *Universitäts-Buchh.* n. 1.20.

Bohn (O.) Üb. die Heimat der Prätorianer. gr. 4, 24 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Böhtlingk (O.) Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung. 4 Thl. 1 Lfg. gr. 4, S. 1-160. St. Petersburg, 1882. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* n. 4.20. I-IV, 1: n. 31.

Brandscheid (Frdr.) Der "Ödipus Tyrannos" d. Sophokles u. seine neuesten Kritiker. gr. 8, 22 S. Wiesbaden, *Rodrian*. —75.

Braumann (G.) Die Principes der Gallier u. Germanen bei Cäsar u. Tacitus. gr. 4, 44 S. Berlin, *W. Weber*. baar n. 1.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). De legibus libri ex recognitione Joh. Vahleni iterum editi. gr. 8, xxiv, 208 S. Berlin, *Vahlen*. n. 4.

— Tusculanarum disputationum libri V. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. L. W. Hasper. 1 Bdchn. Buch I u. II. gr. 8, iv, 114 S. 1.20.

Demosthenes, ausgewählte Reden. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. J. Sörgel. 1 Bdchn. Die drei olynth. Reden u. die 1 Rede gegen Philippos enth. iv, 95 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. 1.20.

Diels (H.) Theophrastea. gr. 4, 28 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. V, 2 partes. gr. 8. Halle, *Niemeyer*. n. 4. I-V, 2: n. 35. Inhalt: 1. De seviris Augustalibus. Scripsit Joa. Schmidt. Adjecta est tabula (lith). viii, 132 S. 1878. 2. S. 135-364.

Edler (O.) Quaestiones Sertorianae. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8, 42 S. Herfordiae, 1880. Berlin, *W. Weber*. baar n. 1.

Ellger (G.) Die Zusätze zu dem Proömium der Hesiodischen Theogonie. [Vers 36-115]. gr. 4, 20 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Enderlein (Osc.) De M. Antonio oratore. Diss. gr. 8, 46 S. Leipzig, 1882. *Fack.* baar n. 1.20.

Erbe (K.) Hermes. Vergleichende Wortkunde der latein. u. griech. Sprache. qu. 8, iv, 244 S. Stuttgart, *Neff. geb.* n. 1.25.

Forcellini (A.) Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera sive onomasticon totius latinitatis, opera et studio Dr. Vinc. De-Vit lucubratum. Distr. 21. gr. 4. 3 Bd. S. 1-72. Prati. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.* (à) n. 2.50.

Goebel (Ed.) Exegetische u. kritische Beiträge zu Platons Apologie u. Kriton. 4, 20 S. Fulda, 1882. Paderborn, *F. Schöninigh*. n. —80.

Gruenwald (Eug.) Quae ratio intercedere videatur inter Quintiliani institutionem oratoriam et Taciti dialogum. Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.20.

Herzfeld (L.) Einblicke in das Sprachliche der semitischen Urzeit. gr. 8, 231 S. Hannover, *Hahn*. n. 6.

Hitzig (H.) Studien zu Isaëus. 4, 29 S. Bern, *Jent & Reinert*. n. 1.

Ihm (Geo.) Quaestiones syntacticae de elocutione Tacitea, comparato

Caesaris, Sallusti, Vellei usu loquendi. gr. 8, 77 S. Giessen, 1882. *Ricker*. n. 1.60.

Isaei orationes cum fragmentis a Dionysio Halicarnassensi servatis ed. H. Buermann. gr. 8, xiv, 156 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 2.40.

Jannarakis (A.) Deutsch-neugriechisches Handwörterbuch. Unter besond. Berücksicht. der neugriech. Volkssprache bearb. 2 Abthlgn. 8, viii, 1372 S. Hannover, *Hahn*. n. 8.

Jordan (H.) De formae urbis Romae fragmento novo disputatio. gr. 4, 10 S. m. 1 Steintaf. Romae. Berlin, *Asher & Co.* baar n.n. 2.

Karabacek (Jos.) Der Papyrusfund v. El-Faijûm. Die textilen Gräberfunde. Ein Vortrag. gr. 8, 43 S. Wien, *Gerold & Co. in Comm.* n. 1.20.

Klatt (M.) Chronologische Beiträge zur Geschichte d. achäischen Bundes. gr. 4, 42 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Kleinschmidt (Max.) De Lucili Saturarum scriptoris genere dicendi. Commentatio ab ordine philosophorum Marpurgensium praemio ornata. gr. 8, viii, 135 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* n. 2.80.

Manns (P.) Die Lehre d. Aristoteles v. der tragischen Katharsis u. Hamartia, erklärt. gr. 8, 86 S. Karlsruhe, *Reuther*. n. 1.80.

Marx (Ant.) Hülfsbüchlein f. die Aussprache der lateinischen Vokale in positionslangen Silben. Mit e. Vorwort v. Frz. Bücheler. gr. 8, xii, 80 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 2.40.

Matthias (Frz.) Quaestionum Blandinianarum capita III. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. gr. 8, 72 S. Halis Sax. 1882. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.20.

Meister (Rich.) Zur griechischen Dialektologie. I. Bemerkungen zur dorischen Accentuation. II. Die Excerpte *περὶ διαλέκτων*, namentlich in Bezug auf die Abschnitte *περὶ Δωρίδος*. 4, 16 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* n. —80.

Merbot (Rhold.) Aesthetische Studien zur angelsächsischen Poesie. gr. 8, iii, 51 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. n. 1.50.

Moll (Ludw.) De temporibus epistularum Tullianarum. Quaestiones selectae, Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.20.

Müller (Thdr.) Angelsächsische Grammatik. Aus dem handschriftl. Nachlasse d. Verf. hrsg. v. Dr. H. Hilmer. gr. 8, xi, 257 S. Göttingen. *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. n. 4.40.

Münzel (Rob.) Quaestiones mythographae. gr. 8, vi, 25 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 1.20.

Nitsche (Wilh.) Der Rhetor Menandros u. die Scholien zu Demosthenes. gr. 4, 26 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. n. 1.

Pannenberg (A.) Der Verfasser d. Ligurinus. Studien zu den Schriften d. Magister Gunther. gr. 4, iv, 39 S. Göttingen, *Peppmüller*. n. 2.

Paucker (Carl.) Supplementum lexicorum latinorum. (In ca. 8 Fasc.) Fasc. 1. gr. 8, 96 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 3.

— Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte. 3 Tle. 1 Lfg. gr. 8. 1 Tl. S. 1–64 u. 2 Tl. S. 1–16. Ebd. n. 3.

— Materialien zur lateinischen Wörterbildungsgeschichte. I–III. gr. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 4.20.

Periplus, der, d. Erythräischen Meeres v. e. Unbekannten. Griechisch u.

deutsch m. krit. u. erklär. Anmerkgn., nebst vollständ. Wörterverzeichnisse v. B. Fabricius. gr. 8, iii, 188 S. Leipzig, *Veit & Co.* n. 6.

Plato's ausgewählte Dialoge. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 3 Bd. Phädo. gr. 8, 118 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 1.20. (1-3, n. 3.20.)

Platon's Apologie d. Sokrates u. Kriton. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. v. Dr. Ed. Goebel. gr. 8, xvi, 112 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* n. 1.20.

Preller (L.) Römische Mythologie. 3 Aufl. v. H. Jordan. 2 Bd. gr. 8, xi, 490 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* (à) n. 5.

Rachse (Hugo). Grammatisch geordnetes hebräisches Vocabularium. gr. 8, iv, 42 S. Halle, *Niemeyer.* n. —60.

Roehl (H.) Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum in usum scholarum composuit H. R. gr. 4, iii, 72 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* n. 4.

Schiche (Th.) Zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus. II. gr. 4, 24 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* n. 1.

Schroeter (Rob.) Quas formas nominum themata sigmatica in vocabulis compositis graecis induant. 8, 95 S. Cothene. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Sort.* baar n. 1.

Sophoclis Oedipus rex, scholarum in usum ed. Frdr. Schubert. 8, xiv, 54 S. Prag, *Tempisky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* n. —40.

Studien, altitalische. Hrsg. v. Dr. Carl Pauli. 1 Hft. Mit 1 lith. Taf. gr. 8, viii, 72 S. Hannover, *Hahn.* n. 3.

Studien, Wiener. Zeitschrift f. class. Philologie. Suppl. der Zeitschrift f. österr. Gymnasien Red.: W. v. Hartel, K. Schenkl. 5 Jahrg. 1883. 2 Hefte. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 174 S. m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn.* n. 10.

Texte, rhätoromanische, hrsg. v. Jak. Ulrich. I. Vier Nidwaldische Texte. 8, vii, 195 S. Halle, *Niemeyer.* n. 3.60.

Tiedke (H.) Nonniana. gr. 4, 24 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* n. 1.

Tirocinium philologum sodalium regii seminarii Bonnensis. gr. 8, iv, 135 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* n. 3.

Vergili Maronis (P.) Aeneis. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Oberlehr. Dr. Osk. Brosin. 1 Bdchn. Buch I-III. viii, 252 S. 2.40.

Wagner (Rich.) Quaestiones de epigrammatis graecis ex lapidibus collectis grammaticae. gr. 8, vi, 127 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* n. 2.

Westphal (Rud.) Die Musik d. griechischen Alterthumes. Nach den alten Quellen neu bearb. gr. 8, vi, 354 S. Leipzig, *Veit & Co.* n. 9.

Zeitschrift f. ägyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde. Hrsg. v. C. R. Lepsius unter Mitwirkg. v. H. Brugsch, Ad. Erman u. L. Stern. 21 Jahrg. 1883. 4 Hfte. hoch 4. 1 Hft. 40 S. m. 2 Steintaf. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 15.

#### SPANISH.

Picatoste (F.) Diccionario popular de la lengua castellana. Madrid, 1883. 8vo, 1059 pp. 8 m.

#### SWEDISH.

Piehl (K.) Dictionnaire du papyrus Harris Nr. 1, publié par S. Birch d'après l'original du British Museum. Upsala, 1883. 8vo, 116 pp. 22.20 m.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Altenglische Bibliothek herausg. v. Eugen Kölbing. Erster Band. Osborn Bokenam's Legenden herausg. v. C. Horstmann. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 5m. 6opf.

Aristotle's Psychology, Greek and English, with introduction and notes. By Ed. Wallace. *Cambridge University Press*, 1882.

Bartholomae (Chr.) Handbuch der alteranischen Dialekte (Kurzgefasste vergleichende Grammatik, Lesestücke u. Glossar). Leipzig, *Breithopf u. Härtel*, 1883.

Braumann (Gustav). Die Principes der Gallier u. Germanen bei Caesar u. Tacitus. Jahresber. über das Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms Gymnasium zu Berlin. Ostern, 1883.

Brugmann (K.) Ueber griechische ἀπα, ἀρ, ἀά u. litauisch įs. Berichte der k. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften, Phil. histor. Classe, Sitzung am 23 April, 1883.

Crane (T. F.) Mediaeval Sermon books and stories. Read before the American Philosophical Society, March 16, 1883.

Kinch (C. F.) Quaestiones criticae Curtianae. Hauniae, In Libraria Gyl-dendaliana, 1883.

Klussmann. Curae Africanæ. Gera, *R. Kindermann*, 1883.

Kölbing's Englische Studien VI, 1, 2. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*. 1883.

Livy. Books XXI-XXV. Translated into English with notes. By A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb. With Maps. London, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*. \$2.

Pindar. The Nemean and Isthmian Odes. By C. A. M. Fennell. *Cambridge University Press*, 1882.

Süss (Eduard). Die Sintfluth. Eine geologische Studia. Sonderabdruck aus: Das Antlitz der Erde. Prag, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1883.

Wallace (Ed.) Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle. 3d ed. (enlarged). *Cambridge University Press*, 1882.

Wiener Studien. Supplement der Zeitschrift für österr. Gymnasien. IV 1, 2. Wien, *Carl Gerold's Söhne*, 1882.

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. IV, 3.

WHOLE No. 15.

---

## I.—THE NEW REVISION OF KING JAMES' REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### III.

#### EXAMINATION OF THE REVISION OF S. MATTHEW (*continued*).

CH. VIII. v. 1. *And* (δέ) *when*, after Sir John Cheke and Rh.; But *whanne*, Wycl.; *When*, A. V. omitting the introductory particle, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 2. *there came to him*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *there came*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* — v. 3. *he*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *Jesus*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.*; see on 4, 12. *stretched forth*, more appropriately, after Rh.; *put forth*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *be—made clean*, after Wycl. and Rh., to conform to v. 2; *be—clean*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *straightway*, by a new rendering; immediately, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; this is a substitution of an English for a Romance word; see on 4, 12. — v. 4. *no man*, after A. V.; but closer to the Greek (μηδενί), *no one*, Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; and so in 9, 30; 16, 20; 17, 9, and throughout the Gospels. — v. 5. *he*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; *Jesus*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 4, 12. — v. 6. *in the house* (ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ), after Wycl., to distinguish from ἐν οἴκῳ, *at home*, 1 Cor. 11, 34; 14,

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Altenglische Bibliothek herausg. v. Eugen Kölbing. Erster Band.  
Bokenam's Legenden herausg. v. C. Horstmann. Heilbronn, Gellert,  
1883. 5m. 60pf.

Aristotle's Psychology, Greek and English, with Introduction  
By Ed. Wallace. *Cambridge University Press*, 1882.

Bartholomae (Chr.) Handbuch der altgermanischen Dialekte  
(vergleichende Grammatik, Lesestücke u. Glossar). Leipzig, Brockhaus,  
1883.

Braumann (Gustav). Die Principes der Gallier u. Germanen.  
Tacitus. Jahresber. über das Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms Gymnasium  
Ostern, 1883.

Brugmann (K.) Ueber griechische ἀπα, ἀρ, ἀά u. litauische  
k. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften, Phil. histor. Cl. 1883.  
April, 1883.

Crane (T. F.) Mediaeval Sermon book.  
American Philosophical Society, March 16,

Kinch (C. F.) Quaestiones criticae Curtianae, 1883.

Klussmann. Curae Africanæ. Gera, R. Köhler.  
Kölbing's Englische Studien VI, 1, 2. H. 1883.  
Livy. Books XXI-XXV. Translated by Church and W. J. Brodribb. With Maps. London,  
Cushings & Bailey. \$2.

Pindar. The Nemean and Isthmian Odes.  
*University Press*, 1882.

Süss (Eduard). Die Sintfluth. Eine geologische Geschichte  
aus: Das Antlitz der Erde. Prag, F. Tempsky.

Wallace (Ed.) Outlines of the Philosophy of Language.  
*Cambridge University Press*, 1882.

Wiener Studien. Supplement der Zeitschrift für  
1, 2. Wien, Carl Gerold's Söhne, 1882.

d space  
examples  
a, Gibbon,

the Show  
pt and Ridi-  
Hist. ch. 1;  
our, Macaulay,  
e case of words  
n, Spect. No. 8;  
the Decline and  
Danube, ib. Hist.  
Hist. ch. 1; the  
words of opposite  
a Nation, Addison,  
No. 1; the strength  
mporal and ecclesias-  
administrations, Macau-  
es, ib. (4) Where the  
o things: between the  
1; this Society may be  
ib. No. 21; between the  
1; both of the prince and  
lling alike, Macaulay, Hist.  
is feelings, ib. (5) Where  
ying two or more: the same  
t. No. 1; all the Passions and  
s and cities, Gibbon, Hist. ch.  
; all the vigour and resolution,  
ne ancient confessions, suppli-  
(6) When each noun has its own  
e Dignity of Thought and Sub-  
n, Spect. No. 42; the oppressed  
Gibbon, Hist. ch. 1; the sublime  
dity, Macaulay, Hist. ch. 1.  
in Greek has about the same range  
es of it are less numerous. Instances  
me heads as above, from Thucydides,  
mosthenes' *Or. de Corona*, and Plato's  
which are added all the instances that  
g to Tischendorf's text.



(1) In the case of words synonymous or nearly so: τὸ δ' ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀληθές, Xen. An. 2, 6, 22; σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ καλῷ, ib. 2, 6, 18; τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν, S. Matt. 9, 11. (2) In the case of words of different meanings: περὶ τὰς ναῦς καὶ τριήρεις, Thuc. 1, 13; τὴν Θεσπρωτίδα καὶ Κεστρίνην, ib. 1, 46; τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ λοχαγούς, Xen. An. 1, 7, 2; τοὺς βοῦς καὶ ὄνους, ib. 1, 1, 6; τῶν λεγόντων καὶ πολιτευομένων, Dem. de Cor. 173; τὰ λεχθέντα καὶ πραχθέντα, Plat. Phaed. 58 C; ὁ Κριτόβουλος—καὶ ἔτι Ἑρμογένης καὶ Ἐπιγένης, etc., ib. 59 B; καὶ (λέγεται) τὸν γε ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ ἄστρο ἀράσθαι, ib. 111 C; τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς, S. Matt. 2, 4; 20, 18; τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, ib. 26, 47; 27, 3; 27, 12; τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, ib. 5, 20; 12, 38; τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, ib. 27, 41; τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων, ib. 3, 7; 16, 1; 16, 6; 16, 11; 16, 12 *δὲ*; τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, ib. 16, 21; τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ, ib. 27, 56; 17, 1; τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως, etc., ib. 4, 25; τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι, etc., ib. 20, 19; 11, 1 (cf. Dem. Ol. 3, 35; Plat. Charm. 161 E). (3) In the case of words of opposite meanings: τὰς ἀνακρούσεις καὶ διέκπλους, Thuc. 7, 70; τὰς μεγίστας (ναῦς) καὶ ἐλαχίστας, ib. 1, 10; τὸ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν, Dem. de Cor. 59; τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ ξενικῶν, ib. 311; περὶ τοῦ μείζονος καὶ ἐλάττονος, Plat. Euthyph. 7 C; τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, S. Matt. 21, 12. (4) Where the form of expression distinctly implies two things: τῆς τε Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας, Thuc. 1, 36; 1, 45; τοὺς τε οἰκήτορας καὶ φρουρούς, ib. 1, 26; 1, 28; τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ib. 1, 1; τὴν τε Κύρου δύναμιν καὶ χώραν, Xen. An. 2, 5, 11; 2, 6, 22; τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐσεβείας τε καὶ δόξης, Dem. de Cor. 1; ib. 286; περὶ τοῦ βαρυτέρου τε καὶ κουφοτέρου, Plat. Euthyph. 7 C; Phaed. 68 D. (5) Where the first noun has an adjective or other adjunct qualifying two or more: τὰς ἐκείνων ἀμαρτίας καὶ παρασκευήν, Thuc. 4, 29; πάντες οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν φίλοι καὶ συντράπεζοι, Xen. An. 1, 9, 31; ἡ ἐμὴ συνέχεια καὶ πλάνοι καὶ ταλαιπωρίαι, Dem. de Cor. 218; ib. 297; τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν εὐνοίας καὶ φιланθρωπίας, ib. 5; ib. 292; τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας, S. Matt. 24, 36 (in τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, S. Matt. 24, 3, the adjective standing with the first noun does not qualify the second, and therefore the article would regularly be repeated with the second noun; the article is used with this phrase in three out of the four passages in which it occurs in S. Matt., namely, 13, 40; 13, 49; 28, 20, and the article is found in this passage also in four uncial MSS, including D). (6) When each noun has its own adjective: οἱ μὲν κατάπτυστοι Θετταλοὶ καὶ ἀκαισθητοὶ Θηβαῖοι, Dem. de Cor. 43; τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαλλαγὴν—καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀσφαλῆ, ib. 324.

The omission of the article in these cases seems to be due partly to the principle of economy, and partly to the circumstance that the article is only a weaker demonstrative pronoun. In the Greek, as is well known, the article mostly appears as a demonstrative in Homer, and its character as the true definite article is not fully developed till we reach the Attic period; and in all the Romance languages the article was actually developed out of the demonstrative *ille*. Now the demonstrative pronoun itself is very rarely repeated. It is not repeated once in the Greek of S. Matt., but is repeated twice in the Revision, in 10, 14 and in 13, 54, and these instances will be considered in their places. It is not repeated in the two first Bks. of the *Anabasis* of Xenophon, nor in Aeschines *contra Ctesiphontem*, nor in the *Phaedo* of Plato; it is repeated only once in Demosthenes *de Corona*, in § 172. And so likewise in English. It is not repeated in the first hundred pages of Hooker, Bk. V, nor in the two first chapters of Gibbon; there is no simple case of it in the first or the twenty-second chapter of Macaulay's History, but in the 1st ch. we find, for the sake of fullness of expression: *both by that superstition and by that philosophy*; and in the 23d: *all this clamour and all this wit*; and in three great speeches of Burke there are but four cases, in two of which it is repeated on account of a change of number: *that time and these chances*; and, *according to that nature and those circumstances*, Conciliation with America, p. 168; and two simple cases: *these opportunities and these arguments*, Present Discontents, p. 14; *that sense and that reason*, American Taxation, p. 97.

This comparatively brief view of a large subject has been given here partly as a matter of reference when other like passages come to be considered, and partly to correct the impression common even among scholars, if they have not given special attention to the subject, that this omission of the article in Greek and in English occurs mostly where the words are synonymous or are taken together to form one idea. But it is now seen what is the license of Greek in this matter, and this license is still greater in English. The Revisers of 1611 seeming to understand this usage often availed themselves of the license of the English, as in 21, 15; 21, 45, and 27, 62, and omitted the second article, while the Revisers of 1881 have in these cases and most others followed the Greek forms, thus converting the license of the Greek into a strict law for their English.

v. 11. *shall sit down*, after A. V.; and so Gen. and Rh.; Dr.

(1) In the case of words such as  
καὶ ἀληθείς, Xen. An. 2, 6, 23

and v. 12. *sons*,  
after Tynd. and  
Dr. Davidson;  
rendering, with  
so Mr. Darby;  
*be outer dark-*  
so Dr. Noyes,  
outer darkness,  
*there shall be*  
rush rendering;  
re shall be the  
*d*; Mr. Darby  
e shall be the  
noun is limited  
all be weeping  
of the articles;  
the rest seems  
*ashing of teeth*,  
Dean Alford. —  
word from the  
bracketed by  
i all the rest;  
ie Greek, after  
matically after  
freely but ex-  
er Gen. nearly,  
e of text after  
.; them, A. V.  
*Am.* — v. 16.  
le, after Wycl.  
*even*, close to  
., inserting the  
er Mr. Darby;  
ien. *possessed*  
; that hadden  
nd Dr. David-  
r Tynd., Cran.,  
eke. — v. 17. *if*  
nd Rh.; that  
see on I, 22.  
fter Gen.; see

1, 2. *our*, the Greek article here having the force of a possessive, A. V. ; see on 1, 24 ; and so in v. 20. *diseases*, after Tynd., sicknesses, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 19. *a scribe*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Tynd. ; *a certain scribe*, A. V. after Cran. and the rest. *there came a scribe*, by a change of order according to the Greek, after Tynd. and Gen. ; *a certain scribe came*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 20. *the birds of the heaven*, incorrectly, after 2d Gen. ; *the birds of the air*, A. V. excellently, after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. ; see on 6, 26. — v. 21. *the disciples*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; *his disciples*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 22. *saith*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* ; *said*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *leave the dead to bury*, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; *let the dead bury*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes. *their own* (ἐαυτῶν) *dead*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; *their dead*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so Dr. Campbell ; and the Revisers themselves give this pronoun by an unemphatic form in 21, 8 ; 23, 37 ; 25, 3. — v. 23. *boat*, correctly, after Rh. ; *ship*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest ; and so in v. 24. — v. 25. *they*, by an omission of words from the text after Tischendorf and Tregelles, which are bracketed by Lachmann ; they are omitted also by the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* ; and so Rh. ; *the disciples*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Save, Lord*, by a new change of order according to the Greek, and by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; *Lord, save us*, A. V. after Wycl. and Rh. ; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* ; but the pronoun, *us*, cannot be well omitted in the English. — v. 27. *And* (δέ), after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen. ; and so Holl. Rev. ; *But*, A. V. after Cran. ; and so de Wette and Germ. Rev. — v. 28. *Gadarenes*, by a change of text after Tischendorf and Tregelles ; *Gergesenes*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* and Lachmann. *possessed with devils* : so A. V. and Dean Alford ; *possessed of devylles*, Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; *that hadden develis*, Wycl. and Rh. ; *demoniacs*, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Davidson ; *possessed by demons*, Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby ; see on 4, 24. *could pass*, after Rh. ; *might pass*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 29. *thou Son of God*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so the Vulg. *Cod. Am.* ; *Jesus, thou Son of God*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 30. *Now*

Noyes, closer  
 close to the G  
 the rest. *cast*,  
 cast out, into o  
 a conformity of  
 cast out into u  
*ness*, preserving  
 Dean Alford,  
 A. V. omitting  
*the weeping an*  
 in the original.  
 weeping and th  
 and Dr. David:  
 weeping and th  
 by a genitive a  
 and the gnash  
 but the render  
 adequate and n  
 and this satisfi  
 v. 13. *as thou h*  
 text after Lac  
 Tregelles; and  
 and so the Vu.  
 Wycl.; the se.  
 Cran. and Gen.  
 cellently after T  
 layde downe, a  
 Lachmann, Tie  
 after Wycl. an  
*And (δὲ) when*,  
 and Rh.; Wh  
 the Greek, after  
 article after Ty  
 that were posse  
*with devils*: so  
 develis, Wycl. &  
 son; see on 4, 2.  
 Gen., and Rh.;  
*might be fulfil*  
 which, Tynd. a  
*Isaiah*, to conf

...; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean *the-skins*, by a new rendering ; ... and Rh. — v. 18. *spake*: so ... was speaking, which is better, closer to the Greek, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *is even* better, preserving the Greek aorist, equivalent to *just now*. Compare, that some frogs were venomous? *now* is used in the same sense, ib. p. after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Wycl.; a woman, which, A. V. after 2, 6. *had*, after Wycl.; was diseased an., and Gen.; but English idiom here *had*, and so Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; Dr. Campbell. *border*, after Dr. Noyes A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 21. *If I* the Greek, and after Wycl. nearly, *If I* but touch, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen. closer to the Greek and to conform to v. 22, shall be made well, Dr. Noyes; shall be whole, ring. — v. 22. *turning and seeing her said*, about, and when he saw her he said, A. V. *good cheer*, after Sir John Cheke; be of good Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 23. *flute-players*, minstrels, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; the Wycl. and the rest except Rh., the multitude. Mr. Darby; a noise, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and *said*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, and Tregelles; so Wycl. and Rh. after *Cod. Am.*; he A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *the damsel*, after said, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so in of the substitution of a Romance for an English a 1, 24. — v. 25. *the crowd*, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. people, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *he entered*, Cran., and Gen.; he went in, A. V. after Wycl., a substitution of a Romance for an English word; see — v. 26. *went forth*, after Rh.; went abroad, A. V. — v. 27. *as Jesus passed by*, closer to the Greek, and nearly, as Jesus passed forth; when Jesus departed,

A. V. after Cran. *from thence*, after Wycl., Sir John Cheke, and Rh.; and so Dr. Noyes; thence, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; see on 4, 21. *crying out*, giving the Greek more fully, after Dr. Noyes; crying, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Have mercy on us, thou Son of David*, by a change of order to conform to the Greek; so Rh. after the Vulg.; *Thou Son of David, have mercy on us*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 28. *They say*, strictly according to the Greek, after Cran. and Rh.; *They said*, A. V. freely, after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 29. *be it done*, after Wycl. and Rh.; *be it*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so in v. 29. — v. 30. *strictly*, after Dr. Campbell and Dean Alford; *straitly*, A. V. by a new rendering; this is the substitution of a modern for an archaic form, though the words are etymologically connected. *See that no man know it*: so A. V. supplying and italicizing *that*, after Rh., and the rest nearly; closely, *See, let no man know* (γινώσκτω) it! and so Mr. Darby except the punctuation. — v. 31. *they went forth and spread*, after Rh.; *they, when they were departed, spread*, A. V. after Cran.; a case of the substitution of an English for a Romance word; and so again in this verse; see on 4, 12. *land*, after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *country*, A. V. after Rh. — v. 32. *And* (δέ) *as*, preserving the introductory particle, after Wycl. and Rh.; *As*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *went forth*, after Rh.; *went out*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *there was brought*, by a new and free rendering to avoid the ambiguity of *they*; so nearly, was presented, Dr. Campbell. *possessed with a devil*: so A. V. after Rh.; *demoniac*, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Davidson; *possessed by a demon*, Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; see on 4, 24. — v. 33. *the devil*, after A. V. and all the rest; *the demon*, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; and so twice in v. 34; see on 4, 24. *the dumb man*, supplying but not italicizing *man*, after Wycl. and Rh., which accords with modern usage; *the dumb*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest, which form was once singular as well as plural (comp. A. V. Ps. 5, 12; 10, 2, &c.; 22, 24; and so often), but this is now regularly used as plural. — v. 34. *By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils*, by a change of order according to the Greek; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; *He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *casteth he out devils* (τὰ δαιμόνια), omitting the Greek article after A. V., but Dr. Camp-

bell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson all retain it. — v. 35. *all the cities and the villages*, preserving the second Greek article against the English idiom, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; all the cities and villages, A. V. correctly, after Wycl., Rh., and Sir John Cheke; and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes. When two or more nouns have a common adjective standing with the first, the article is regularly omitted with the second and following nouns; as, πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας 21, 12; πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς 2, 4; πάσuis ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι S. Luke 1, 6: so, τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας S. Mark 6, 36; τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς S. Luke 9, 12, where the article is repeated in A, C, D, and other uncials, but it is omitted by Tischendorf and bracketed by Tregelles. In 24, 36, τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ ὥρας, the second article is not found in x, B, D, and other uncials, and is omitted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and in the parallel passage, S. Mark 13, 32, the second article is wanting in A, E, F, G, and other uncials, in the important cursive No. 69, and in the title of the κεφάλαιον in which it stands.

But where the modification standing with the first noun does not affect the second, &c., the article is rightly repeated; as, τοὺς ἑπτα ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας 15, 36; τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, 24, 3, according to D, Γ and other uncials; see on 8, 11 (5).

There are three passages in S. Matthew which require notice here. In πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, 27, 1, the article is repeated against regular usage, and A. V. after Rh. rightly omits it, *all the chief priests and elders*, but the Revisers insert it; in the similar expression in S. Mark 14, 53, A. V., against English usage, repeats the article after the Greek, and the Revisers do the same. In 11, 13, πάντες οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος, *all the prophets and the law*; and 22, 40, ὁλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, *the whole law and the prophets*, the adjective in each passage is used in two different senses, *all the prophets and the (whole) law*, &c., as appears in this corrected translation of the Revisers, and so the second article is properly repeated both in the Greek and in the English.

For further examples of this omission of the article, in English as well as in Greek, see on 8, 11 under (5).

*all manner of*—*all manner of*, repeated after the Greek; all manner of, 1st Gen., not repeating it; all maner, Tynd.; every—every, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Rh. *disease*—*sickness*, by a new rendering; and so 10, 1; *sickness*—*disease*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and



Gen. *sickness*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; disease among the people, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 36. *with compassion for*, closer to the Greek (περί c. gen.), after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Mr. Darby; with compassion on, A. V. by the old form, after Tynd. and Cran.; this noun in A. V. is commonly used with *on* or *upon*, and sometimes with *of*, as Heb. 10, 34; compare *to have pity on*, S. Matt. 18, 33, or *upon*, Deut. 7, 16, which is still the common form. *they were distressed*, by a new rendering; they were harassed, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; they fainted, A. V. after Sir John Cheke nearly, *thei weer fainted*; they were pyned awaie, Tynd. *scattered*, after Sir John Cheke; scattered abroad, A. V. freely and idiomatically, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *not having*, close to the Greek and after Wycl.; having no, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., which is smoother, and like the form adopted by the Revisers themselves in v. 12. — v. 37. *truly—but* (μὲν—δέ); so A. V. after Cran.; indeed—but, Dr. Noyes, which seems preferable here, and the Revisers themselves have so rendered this formula in 3, 11; 13, 32; 17, 11; 20, 23; 26, 41, and elsewhere. *is—are*; supplied, but not italicized; *is—are*, A. V.; supplied also by Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; but Wycl. supplies only the first verb: there is myche ripe corne, but few werke men; and so Sir John Cheke: the hervest is great, and the woorkmen few; this is more pleasing to the ear, and unifies the sentence, as in 5, 11. The suppression of the verb in the second clause is sometimes a great beauty; as, the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory, A. V. Isa. 60, 19; and this may take place not only when the verbs would be of different numbers; as, in tragedy the design is weighty, and the persons great, Dryden, I, p. 183. Such was the state of the Roman frontiers, and such the maxims of Imperial policy, Gibbon, History, ch. I, p. 142; three hundred of his nobility were treacherously slaughtered, and himself detained captive, Hume, History, ch. I. Beyond this lies the Desert on one side, and on the other barbarous nations, Spedding's Reviews, etc., p. 236; and when they would be of different persons; as, the Sun is just rising, and I myself just now come to this place, Walton, Angler, p. 40; but even when they would be of different numbers and persons; as, He (God) is above, and we upon earth, Hooker; we are the clay, and thou our potter, A. V. Isa. 64, 8. — v. 38. *that he send*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; that he will send, A. V. after Cran.

[illegible]

*brass*: so A. V. after Tynd. and Gen.; this requires the marginal: *Gr.* copper or bronze; Erz, de Wette; Kupfer, Weissäcker. — v. 10. *no wallet*, by a new rendering; no scrip, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *neither—nor—nor*, after Dr. Davidson; *neither—neither—nor yet*, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. *stuff* (πάθος, sing.) after Tynd. and Gen.; all the rest have a singular number here except A. V., staves; Stephen's Greek text of 1550 and Beza's of 1604 give the singular, but the plural (πάθους) is the reading of

C, E, and several other uncial MSS. *the labourer*, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; the workman, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *food*, after Sir John Cheke; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; meat, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 11. *village*, to conform to 9, 35, after Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; town, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest except Wycl., *castel*. *search out*, by a new and closer rendering of the Greek (*ἐξεράσαστε*); *serch*, Sir John Cheke; *enquire*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. *go forth*, closer to the Greek, after Rh.; *go thence*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 12. *as ye enter*, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; *when ye come into*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; this is a case of the substitution of a Romance for an English word; see on 1, 24. *the house*, preserving the Greek article, after Rh.; *an house*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 14. *as ye go forth*, after Mr. Darby; *going forth*, Rh.; *when ye depart*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; this is a case of the substitution of an English for a Romance word; see on 4, 12. *that house or that city*, incorrectly, after Tynd. and Gen., the demonstrative being used only once in the Greek and put with the last noun; *that house or city*, A. V. correctly, after Wycl. and Sir John Cheke; so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford; and so the Germ. Rev.; see on 8, 11. The demonstrative stands after the first noun in *Cod. b*, it is wanting altogether in *Cod. f*, and in *Cod. Am.* and the Clem. ed. of the Vulgate; but the common modifier of two or more words sometimes stands with the last word; see on 24, 30. — v. 17. *councils*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; *the councils*, A. V. inserting the article, after Tynd. and the rest. *and in their synagogues they will scourge you*, by a change of order according to the Greek, after Rh. and the Vulg.; and *they will scourge you in their synagogues*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 18. *yea—and* (*καί—δέ*), by a new rendering, giving both particles; *And*, A. V. omitting one, after Wycl. and all the rest; and so the Vulg. *before governors and kings shall ye be brought*, by a change of order according to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; and so the Vulg.; *ye shall be brought before governors and kings*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles*, after Wycl. and all except A. V., which has: *for a testimony against them and the Gentiles*; the Revisers here follow Meyer in making the reference general (*to*), although some great names make it specific (*against*), as S. Chrysostom and Theophy-

lact among the ancients, Erasmus and Beza among the moderns; *to them and to the Gentiles*, repeating the preposition for the simple dative in the Greek, after Wycl. and all except Rh., to them and the Gentiles; in such cases the Revisers, like A. V., have commonly exercised a wise liberty according to the occasion, employing the preposition once only; as in 5, 20; 10, 14; 11, 22, etc., sixteen instances in all; or repeating it, as here and in 22, 32; 28, 19, etc., ten instances in all. — v. 19. *be not anxious*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson; *be not careful*, Dean Alford and Mr. Darby; *take no thought*, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest; *nyle ye thenke*, Wycl.; see on 6, 24. *in that hour*, close to the Greek, after Wycl., Rh., and 2d Gen.; in that same hour, A. V. by a new rendering; Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. still stronger, even in that same houre; see on 5, 19. — v. 20. *the Spirit—that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; the Spirit—which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 6. — v. 21. *brother shall deliver up brother*, omitting the articles according to the Greek, and after Mr. Darby; the brother—the brother, A. V. inserting the articles, after Wycl. and all the rest. *and the father his child*, supplying but not italicizing *the* and *his*, after Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford; and father child, close to the Greek, Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; the father the child, A. V. by a new rendering; the father lijkwijs the child, Sir John Cheke; the fadir the sone, Wycl. and all the rest. *children shall rise up against parents*, close to the Greek, after Mr. Darby; the children shall rise up against *their* parents, A. V. supplying *the* and *their*, but italicizing only the latter, after Gen. — v. 22. *all men*, supplying *men*, but not italicizing it; all *men*, A. V. *he—the same* (οὗτος) *shall be saved*, after Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; *he shall be saved*, Rh. and 2d Gen.; and so Mr. Darby; *shall be saved*, A. V. omitting the pronoun after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. — v. 23. *the next*, by a new and free rendering of the Greek (τὴν ἐτέραν, after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; τὴν ἄλλην, Stephen's ed. 1550, Beza's, 1604); another, A. V., Wycl., and all the rest; so the Vulg.; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford; the other, close to the Greek, Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; the formula, οὗτος—ὁ ἕτερος or ὁ ἄλλος, is a strange one, instead of ὁ εἷς—ὁ ἕτερος, *the one—the other*, 6, 24; S. Luke 7, 41; or εἷς—ὁ ἕτερος, *one—the other*, 6, 24; S. Luke 16, 13. *shall have gone through*, after Dr. Campbell; *shall goe thorow*, Cran.; *shall have gone over*, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 24. *A disciple*, close to the Greek, after Dr.

Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson; The disciple, A. V. inserting the definite article, after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dean Alford and Mr. Darby; and so again in this verse, *a servant*, for the servant. *his* (τοῦ) *master*, after Tynd. and Gen., the article having the force of a possessive pronoun; *his* master, A. V. by a new rendering; see on 1, 24. — v. 25. *shall they call*, supplied and italicized; and so A. V. after Tynd. and Cran.; and so in substance Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; it is better to omit these words after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. — v. 26. *nothing covered,—and hid*: and so A. V. by a new rendering, but after Rh. nearly, and secrete; *and* (καί) continues the negative here, and therefore *nor hid* is better after 2d Gen.; Cran. repeats the negative from the preceding, and nothyng hyd; and so in substance Wycl., Tynd., and 1st Gen. — v. 27. *in the darkness—in the light*, close to the Greek, but in violation of English idiom, after Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; better, *in the darke—in the light*, with Sir John Cheke and Rh.; and so Dr. Campbell, or *in darknessis—in the light*, with Wycl.; and so Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby. *speak*, close to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *that speak*, A. V. supplying *that*, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dean Alford. *proclaim*, after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; *that preach*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 28. *be not afraid of*, to keep closer to the Greek (μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπό, a Hebraism, also in S. Luke 12, 4; after LXX, as Deut. 1, 29; Ps. 21, 25 (23 A. V.), etc.), after A. V. in S. Luke 12, 4; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *fear not*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes. *them which* — *him which*: so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *hem that* — *hym that*, Wycl.; *them that* — *him that*, Rh.; see on 2, 6. — v. 29. *and* (καί): and so A. V. after Wycl. and all; better, *and yet*, with de Wette, Weizsäcker, and Dr. Davidson; yet, Dr. Campbell and Germ. Rev.; see on 1, 25. *not one of them shall fall*, after Rh.; one of them shall not fall, A. V. after Gen.; and so Mr. Darby. — v. 31. *Fear not*, closer to the Greek, after Rh.; *Fear ye not*, A. V. supplying the subject after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dean Alford; see on 4, 17. — v. 32. *Every one—who*, closer to the Greek form, and nearly after Wycl., Cran., and Rh.; *Whosoever*, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. *him will I also confess*, by a change of order nearer to the Greek (καὶ γὰρ) and after Rh.; *him will I confess also*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on 2, 8.

*my Father which*: so A. V. after Tynd. and all except Wycl., my fadir that; and so in v. 33; see on 2, 6. — v. 34. *I came*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Wycl. and Rh.; I am come, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and so in v. 35; see on 2, 2. — v. 35. *the daughter—the daughter in law*, supplying the definite articles: so A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; daughter—daughter-in-law, Dr. Campbell, strictly after the Greek; and so substantially Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson. — v. 38. *that doth not take his cross and follow*, to unify the expression, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; that taketh not his cross and followeth, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; see on 5, 11. — v. 39. *his life—his life*, with a new marginal note, Or, *soul*, which would be absurd in this passage. — v. 42. *cold water*, supplying *water*, but not italicizing it, after Gen.; cold water, A. V. less correctly; for ψυχρόν in Greek, like *gelida* in Latin, is used absolutely for *cold water*; aqua frigida, Vulg. freely.

CH. XI. v. 1. *it came to pass—he departed*: so A. V. against the English idiom, after Wycl. and Rh.; it came to pass, that, Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dr. Noyes; see on 7, 28. *and to teach and preach*, after Wycl., Sir John Cheke, and Rh.; to teach and to preach, A. V. with more dignity, after Tynd. and the rest; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; and the Rev. in Acts 5, 42. The sign of the infinitive where two or more infinitives come together may, according to good usage, be repeated or omitted with the second, etc., as suits the occasion. — v. 2. *when John heard* (ἀκούσας), after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; had heard, A. V. more exactly, after Wycl. and Rh. *the Christ*, after the Holl. Rev. and Dr. Davidson; the Messiah, Dr. Campbell; Christ, A. V. omitting the article after Wycl. and all the rest; and so de Wette, the Germ. Rev., Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Mr. Darby; see on 1, 17. *by his disciples*, by a change of text (διά for δύο) after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; two of his disciples, A. V. after Wycl. and all; and so *Cod. Am.* — v. 3. *that cometh*, close to the Greek, after Dr. Campbell; that should come, A. V. after Gen. *look we*, after Rh.; do we look, A. V. after Cran. — v. 4. *And* (καί) *Jesus*, preserving the introductory particle, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; Jesus, A. V. freely, after Tynd. and Cran. *Go your way*, to conform to S. Luke 7, 22, after Sir John Cheke nearly, Go iour wais; Go, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; this is a case of the substitution of an archaic for a common form; see on 4, 12. *and tell*, to conform to S. Luke 7, 22, after Wycl. and Sir John Cheke; and shew—again, A. V. after Cran. *the things which*, nearer the Greek (ἃ), after Dr. Davidson; what

things, nearer still, Gen.; those things which, A. V. after Wycl. nearly, tho thingis that. — v. 5. *the blind—the lame—the lepers—the deaf—the dead—the poor*; so A. V. supplying the article in each case; Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson omit it in each case after Wycl. *good tidings*, after Dr. Noyes; the glad tidings, Tynd. and Cran.; the Gospel, A. V. ed. 1611, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; *good tidings* is the constant form of A. V. in O. T.; as, 2 Sam. 18, 27; 2 Kings 7, 9, &c.; the Revisers have used *glad tidings* twice, in Rom. 10, 15 and 1; Thess. 3, 6. *and the dead*, by an addition to the text after Tischendorf and Tregelles; the dead, A. V. after Wycl. and all. — v. 6. *shall find none occasion of stumbling in me*, after Dr. Noyes (*no occasion*); shall not be offended in me, A. V. after Gen.; so nearly Tynd., Cran., and Sir John Cheke; and so Dean Alford and Mr. Darby; see on 5, 29. — v. 7. *these went their way*, after Rh. nearly, they went their way; they departed, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; this is a case of the substitution of an English for a Romance expression; see on 4, 12. *to behold*, to distinguish between the Greek verb here and in the next verse, after Dr. Davidson; to gaze upon, Dean Alford; to see, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 8. *for to see*; so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; to see, Wycl. and Rh.; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; see on 24, 1. *in soft raiment*, supplying and italicizing *raiment*; in soft raiment, A. V. after Gen. *in soft raiment*, as before; in soft clothing, A. V. ed. 1611, after Gen. — v. 9. *wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet?* by a change of punctuation after Tischendorf; and so Tregelles (marg.); what went ye out for to see? A prophet? A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *to see*, after Wycl. and Rh.; for to see, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 24, 1. *much more than*, to give the Greek (*περισσότερον*) more fully, after de Wette, Germ. Rev., and Holl. Rev. — v. 10. *This is he*, by the omission of a word from the text by Tischendorf, which is bracketed by Lachmann and Tregelles; For this is he, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so *Cod. Am. my messenger—Who*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; —that, Wycl.; which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 6. — v. 11. *hath not arisen*, to preserve the Greek perfect, after Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; arose there not, Tynd. and Gen.; arose not, Cran.; see on 2, 2. *yet he that is but little*, by a new rendering, but after Mr. Darby nearly, But



the little one; notwithstanding he that is least, A. V. by a new rendering, but nearly after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., notwithstanding he that ys lesse. — v. 12. *men of violence*, by a new rendering and nearer the Greek (βιασταί); violent men, Wycl., and so Dr. Davidson; the violent, A. V. after Cran., Gen., and Rh. — v. 14. *if ye are willing* (θέλετε) *to receive it*, to avoid ambiguity, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; if ye will (not an auxiliary here) receive it, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *Elijah*, to conform to the Hebrew; Elias, A. V. after Gen. and Rh.; see on 1, 2. *Elijah, which*; so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; Elie that, Wycl. and Rh.; see on 2, 6. *is to come*, after Wycl.; was for to come, A. V. after Cran. — v. 16. *the market-places*, after Cran., and supplying, but not italicizing, the article; in the markets, A. V. after Gen. — vv. 16, 17. *which call—and say*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so in substance Wycl. and Rh. after *Cod. Am.*; calling—And saying, A. V. by a new rendering. *We piped—ye did not dance*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Rh.; We have piped—ye have not danced, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so also, *we wailed—ye did not mourn*, by a new rendering; we hau morned—ye hau not weilid, Wycl. and Sir John Cheke; we have mourned—ye have not lamented, A. V. after Gen.; see on 2, 2. — v. 18. *a devil*; so A. V. after Wycl. and all; a demon, according to the Greek, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; daemonium, Vulg.; see on 4, 24. — v. 19. *a gluttonous man*, by a new order and freely; a man gluttonous, A. V. close to the Greek; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson. *And* (καί), after Wycl., Cran., and Rh.; But, A. V. more suitably to the passage, after Gen.; so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; And yet, Dean Alford; see on 1, 25. *by her works*, by a change of text after Tischendorf and Tregelles; of her children, A. V. after Wycl. (*sones*) and all the rest; and so *Cod. Am.* — v. 21. *had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you*, by a change of order according to the Greek, after Rh.; and so *Cod. Am.*; which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so nearly in v. 23. — v. 22. *Howbeit*, by a new rendering; the Revisers have so often introduced this old and awkward word, that it may be regarded as one of the characteristics of their work; it does not serve to distinguish the Greek word used here (πλήν); for while they have rendered it *howbeit* again in v. 24, they have left the old rendering of it, *but*, in 18, 7, and *nevertheless* in 26, 39 and 26, 64; *But*, A. V. after Sir John



Cheke and 2d Gen. ; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *Nevertheless*, Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *in the day of judgement*, to conform to v. 24, after Wycl. and Rh. ; at the day, etc., A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 23. *shalt thou be exalted unto heaven ?* after Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles ; and so in substance Wycl. and Rh. after *Cod. Am.* ; which art exalted unto heaven, A. V. by a new rendering. *thou shalt go down*, after Wycl. and Rh. (*come*), by a change of text after Lachmann and Tregelles ; thou—shalt be brought down, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *unto Hades*, leaving the Greek word untranslated, after Dr. Campbell, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; to hell, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; so Sir John Cheke, and so Dean Alford. — v. 24. *Howbeit*, by a new rendering ; But, A. V. by a new rendering ; see on v. 22. — v. 25. *At that season*, by a new but not invariable rendering of the Greek word (*καὶρῶ*) ; and so in 12, 1 ; 14, 1 ; time, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; so Sir John Cheke ; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. *answered and said* : so A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest ; and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Mr. Darby ; said, Dr. Campbell. The phrase here literally rendered *answered and said* is of very frequent occurrence in the Gospels, and commonly appears under the form ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, as here, in S. Matt., S. Mark, and S. Luke ; and in the form ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν in S. John. It was derived from the LXX, and occurs in the first form in Gen. 18, 27 ; 27, 37 ; 31, 36 ; 31, 43 ; 40, 18 ; 41, 16 ; 42, 22, &c. ; and in the second form in Exod. 4, 1 ; Numb. 22, 18 ; Deut. 1, 14 ; 1, 41 ; Josh. 1, 16, &c. ; and both also occur with some modifications as well in the LXX as in the N. T. Now the Hebrew verb (אָנַף), represented in these forms, does not in itself mean *to answer*, but *to strike up, speak out, say* ; often in answer to a question ; as, Gen. 18, 27 ; 23, 10 ; 27, 37, &c. which are rightly rendered by the LXX and by A. V. ; but sometimes without a question either expressed or implied ; as, Numb. 11, 28 ; Deut. 25, 9, &c. which are wrongly rendered, *answered and said*, both by the LXX and by A. V. ; and Deut. 26, 5 and 27, 14, &c., which are wrongly rendered by the LXX but rightly by A. V. ; and Job 38, 1, which is rightly but briefly rendered by the LXX, εἶπεν, *said*, but wrongly by A. V., *answered—and said*. A like confusion may be found in the Latin Vulgate. The Greek ὅτι is both a demonstrative conjunction, *that*, and a causal, *because, since*. Now the Latin trans-

lator after verbs of *saying, thinking, &c.*, often took the wrong meaning of *ὅτι*, and rendered for instance, λέγω *ὅτι* in S. Matt. 5, 22 by *dico quia*, and the same in 3, 9 by *dico quoniam*; and δοκοῦσιν *ὅτι* in 6, 7 by *putant quia*; but no one would render this Latin by *I say because, I say since, they think because*, but by *I say that, &c.*

And this confusion of the LXX was carried over into N. T. usage, and the formula, *answered and said*, was commonly used correctly, but sometimes, as in the O. T. where no question was asked or implied; as in the present passage and in 17, 4 and 22, 1 and elsewhere, and therefore the proper rendering would be *spake and said* or the like, and so de Wette and Diodati in the passages just cited, and also in 12, 38; 28, 5; and 19, 27 de Wette treats in the same way, but Diodati renders that *answered and said. I thank thee—that* (*ὅτι, that or because*), after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; because, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; for (= *for that*), Wycl. *didst hide—didst reveal*, to preserve the Greek aorist, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; hast hid—hast revealed, A. V. after Wycl. and all; so Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; see on 2, 2. *the wise*, etc.; so A. V., supplying the article but not italicizing it, after Tynd. and all except Wycl., wise men and prudent; wijs and witti men, Sir John Cheke; men wise and of understanding, Dean Alford. *understanding*, after Gen. and Dean Alford nearly, of understanding; prudent, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 26. *yea, Father*, close to the Greek (*ναί*), after Sir John Cheke and Rh.; so Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; Even so, Father, A. V. freely but excellently, after Tynd.; so Dean Alford. *it was well pleasing*, by a new rendering, but after Wycl. nearly, it was plesynge; it seemed good, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 27. *have been delivered*, rendering the Greek aorist as perfect, after Dr. Campbell, hath imparted everything; are delivered, A. V. inexactly, after Rh.; ben govune, Wycl.; and, are given, the rest; were delivered, Dr. Noyes, preserving the aorist, and so Dr. Davidson; see on 2, 2. *no one*, closer to the Greek (*οὐδεὶς*), after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; none, Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Dr. Davidson; no man, A. V. after Gen. and Rh. *save the Father*, by a new rendering to conform to the next sentence; but—save, A. V. for the sake of variety, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; but—but, Wycl. and Rh. *save—he*: so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; so also the Revisers after A. V. in S. John 6, 46; Rev. 13, 17; but in Rev. 2, 17 they have altered *saving he* to *but he. doth any know*, closer to the Greek,

after Rh. ; knoweth any man, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *the Son willeth* (βούληται) *to reveal*, by a new rendering, to avoid ambiguity ; so, it shal please the Sonne to reveile, Rh. ; it is the will of the Son to reveal, Dr. Noyes ; the Son is minded, etc., Dean Alford ; the Son may be pleased, etc., Mr. Darby ; the Son may wish, etc., Dr. Davidson ; the Son will (not here an auxiliary) reveal, etc., A.V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. (*will open*) ; see on v. 14. — v. 30. *For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light* : so A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; but the verb is expressed only once (and with the latter clause) in the Greek ; it would be closer therefore, and also better thus : *For my yoke is easy, and my burden light* ; and so Wycl., for my yok is softe, and my charge ligt ; and Rh., For my yoke is sweete, and my burden light ; this form unifies the sentence ; see on 5, 11 ; and on the suppression of the verb in the second clause, see on 9, 37.

CH. XII. v. 1. *season* (καιρῷ), by a new rendering ; time, A. V. after Wycl. and all ; see on 11, 25. *cornfields*, closer to the Greek, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; corn, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *ears*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. ; the ears, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 2. *the Pharisees, when they saw it, said*, by a new and closer rendering ; still closer, the Pharisees seing it said, Sir John Cheke ; when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said, A. V. after Cran. *which it is not lawful to do*, after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes ; which is not lawful to do, A. V. after Wycl. and all, and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; and so in v. 4. *upon the Sabbath*, after Gen., and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes ; still closer, upon a Sabbath, Dr. Davidson ; upon the Sabbath day, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. — v. 4. *them that*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; those who, Dr. Noyes ; them which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest ; see on 5, 44. — v. 5. *how that*, by a free rendering of the Greek (ὅτι), after A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and so Dean Alford ; that, Wycl. and Rh. ; and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. The Revisers have followed A. V. in rendering ὅτι (*that*) by *how that* also in 16, 12 and 16, 21 ; and ὡς (*how or that*) by *how that* for *that* in S. Mark 14, 72 ; and in S. Luke 22, 61 they have changed *how* into *how that*, and have supplied *how* in S. Mark 5, 19. It must be borne in mind that the particle in Greek in such cases is sometimes only an adverb of manner, and then is rightly rendered *how* ; as πῶς in 12, 4 ; S. Mark 2, 26 ; 12, 26 ; 12, 41 ; and so ὅπως in S. Luke 24, 20 ; and sometimes the am-

biguous word, ὡς, *how* or *that*, may be rendered with propriety either way, when the idea of manner is not excluded; as in S. Luke 6, 4; 8, 47; and 24, 6, in which passages the Revisers, following A. V., render it by *how*. And in English the use of *how* introducing narratives or the summary of a narrative, and carrying with it the idea of manner, is still good, as at the opening of Lord Macaulay's History, like ὡς at the opening of the 2d Bk. of Xenophon's Anabasis.

In the development of *how that*, *how* was not prefixed to *that*, but *that* was subjoined to *how*, after the analogy of *where that*, *when that*, *where* and *when* being originally interrogatives and afterward converted into relatives by this suffix. This usage was extended, and thus *if that*, *though that*, and *lest that* became common in the 16th and 17th centuries. In the first half of the 16th century *how for that* is found in Ellis, Original Letters, p. 310 *bis*; and *how that for that* on pp. 257, 258, 259, 267 and 315; but in the second half of the 16th century they are not found at all in the first hundred pages of Hooker, Bk. V., nor in the 17th century in the long Preface of the Translators of A. V., nor in Walton's Angler, nor in the hundred and twelve pages of Dryden's Essay on Dramatick Poesy, nor in the 18th century in Addison's own papers of the first hundred of the Spectator. *How that*, and *how* without the idea of manner, have long been disused in good English, whether written or spoken, and given up to common and illiterate life, and on account of their associations, they ought not to have been retained in the new revision, much less in additional cases to have been introduced into it. *on the sabbath day*, supplying *day*, which they excluded in v. 4 and rendering the Greek plural by a singular, after Tynd.; *on the sabbaths* exactly, Dr. Noyes; *on the sabbath days*, A. V. after Cran. and Gen.; so in vv. 10, 12. *and* (καί); so A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest except Tynd., and yet; so Sir John Cheke; and nevertheless, Dr. Campbell; see on 1, 25. *guiltless*, by a new rendering for the sake of uniformity; see v. 7; *blameless*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 6. *one greater than the temple is here*, to conform to the order of the Greek, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson. — v. 7. *this*, supplied but not italicized; *this*, A. V. *I desire*, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; *I will have*, A. V. after Gen. — v. 8. *of*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *even of*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 9. *he departed thence, and went*,

after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; when he was departed thence, he went, A. V. by a new rendering. *behold, a man*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; lo, a man, Wycl. also after the Vulg.; behold there was a man, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *having a withered hand*, by an omission from the text, after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; having *his* hand withered, A. V. by a new and incorrect rendering of their own text, but nearly after Wycl., Cran., and Gen., which had his hande dried up. — v. 11. *of you*, closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; among you, A. V. after Gen. *if this*, close to the Greek, after Mr. Darby; if the same, Rh.; if it, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Gen. *will he not*; so A. V. after Rh.; better, will not, after Cran., to give unity to the sentence; so Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; see on 5, 11. — v. 12. *of more value*, by a new rendering, after Dr. Noyes nearly, of more worth; greatly excel, Dr. Campbell, which is nearer the Greek form. *to do good*, after Wycl., and better suiting the context; to do well, A. V. by a new rendering and exactly after the Greek form. — v. 13. *thy hand*, after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; thine hand, A. V. after Wycl.; see on 6, 17. *as*, after Wycl. and Gen.; like as, A. V. after Cran. — v. 14. *But* (δέ), after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; And, Wycl. and Rh.; Then, A. V. loosely after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *took counsel*, after Sir John Cheke, took council; so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; held a council (1611), A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. — v. 15. *Wycl.*; But, A. V. after Cran., Gen., and Rh. *g it withdrew*, after the form of the Greek; and so wing it, retired; and Dr. Noyes, Jesus knowing it, n Jesus knew it, he withdrew, A. V. by a new rendering, by a new rendering, and substituting a English word; see on 1, 24. *many*, by the omission from the text after Lachmann and Tischendorf, sketed by Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after at multitudes, A. V. after Gen. — v. 17. *that it ed which*: so A. V. after Cran., Gen., and Rh.; that fulfilled, that, Wycl.; see on 1, 22. *Isaiah*; Esaias, 1, 2. — v. 18. *in whom my soul is well pleased* .V.; in whom it hath wel plesid to my soule, Wycl.; ul hath wel liked, Rh., and both after the Vulg.; *clare*, after Dr. Noyes; shew, A. V. after Tynd. and 9. *cry aloud*, nearer to the Greek (κραυγάζει), after

Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; crie out, Rh.; cry, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *any one*, close to the Greek (τις), after Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; any man, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 21. *hope*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; trust, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 22. *one possessed with a devil*, after A. V.; and so Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; that hadde a fende, Wycl.; a demoniac, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Davidson; one possessed by a demon, Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; see on 4, 24. *the dumb man spake and saw*, by omissions from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; the blind and dumb both spake and saw, A. V. after Cran. — v. 23. *the multitudes*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; the people, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Is this*, more in accordance with the Greek (Μήτι οὗτος), after A. V. (ed. 1611) by a new rendering; Is not this, A. V. (ed. 1638) after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 24. *This* (οὗτος) *man*, supplying man, but not italicizing it, after 2d Gen.; *This fellow*, A. V. after all but Wycl., He this; this pronoun is often used in classical as well as in Hellenistic Greek by way of contempt or aversion; A. V. sometimes expressed this as here, and sometimes disregarded it, as in S. Matt. 9, 3; S. Mark 2, 7; S. Luke 15, 2; S. John 7, 27 and elsewhere; A. V. expressed it when the pronoun designates our Lord in S. Matt. 12, 24; 26, 61; 26, 71; S. Luke 22, 59; 23, 2; S. John 9, 29; and when it designates S. Paul in Acts 18, 13; but the Rev. have well changed the expression in all these passages to *this man*. *devils—devils*: so A. V. after Tynd. and all except Wycl., fendis—fendis; demons—demons, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; and so in vv. 27, 28, except Wycl., develis—fendis; see on 4, 24. — v. 25. *he*, by change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *Jesus*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so *Cod. Am.*; see on 4, 12. *knowing their thoughts he said*, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby; knew their thoughts and said, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. — v. 26. *if Satan casteth* (Greek indicative), after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; if Satan cast, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; see on 4, 3. *how then shall*, by a change of order after Rh.; *how shall then*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 27. *them*, supplied but not italicized; *them*, A. V. *therefore shall they*, by a change of order after Dr. Noyes; therefore they shall, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson, which is better as giving the Greek more exactly (διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοί).

— v. 28. *if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils*, by a change of order to conform to the Greek; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. *then is the kingdom of God come*, by a change of order after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; then the kingdom of God is come, A.V. after Wycl. *upon you*, closer to the Greek (ἐπὶ c. acc.), after Rh.; unto you, A.V. after Cran. and Gen. — v. 29. *Or*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; Or else, A. V. freely and idiomatically, after Cran. and Gen.; so Dean Alford; the Revisers have made the same change in v. 33, but they have well left the old form in S. John 14, 11; Acts 24, 20; Rom. 2, 15; Rev. 2, 5; 2, 16; *or else* is thus used in Ellis, Original Letters, pp. 158, 180, 232, 327, etc.; Hooker, V. 13 *bis*, 17, 21, 48; Walton, Angler, pp. 83, 209, 225, 227; Temple, I, pp. 93, 112, 120; Dryden, Dram. Poesy, p. 94; and is still in good use. *the house of the strong man*, after Rh. nearly, the house of the strong; a strong man's house, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 30. *scattereth*, after Rh.; scattereth abroad, A. V. freely and idiomatically, after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 31. *Therefore*, closer to the Greek (Διὰ τοῦτο), after Wycl. and Rh.; Wherefore, A.V. after Tynd. and the rest. *Every sin*, after Rh. and 2d Gen.; All manner of sin, A.V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *the Spirit*, close to the Greek, after Tynd., Cran., and Rh.; the *Holy Ghost*, A.V. supplying *Holy*, after Gen; see on v. 32. *forgiven*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. — v. 32. *shall speak*, more correctly, after Gen. and Rh.; speaketh, A.V. after Tynd. and Cran.; and so again in this verse. *the Holy Spirit*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the Holy Ghost, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; the A. V., as is well known, employed both forms, *the Holy Ghost* and *the Holy Spirit*; the Rev. have changed the former into the latter in the following passages: S. Matt. 12, 32; S. Mark 3, 29; 12, 36; S. Luke 2, 25; 2, 26; 4, 1; 12, 10; 12, 12; S. John 1, 33; 14, 26; Acts 2, 4; 6, 5; 1 Cor. 12, 3; S. Jude 20; they have employed the form *the Holy Ghost* seventy-two times in all; and the form *the Holy Spirit* nineteen times. *nor in that which is to come*, after Dean Alford nearly, neither in that which is to come; neither in the *world* to come, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., repeating *world* from the foregoing, as it did in 5, 20, which was there followed by the Rev., and the effect is excellent here. — v. 33. *its fruit*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; his fruit, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest;



and so twice more in this verse; see on 5, 13. *or*, after Rh.; or else, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on v. 29. — v. 34. *Ye offspring*, after Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby nearly, Offspring; O generation, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. — v. 35. *The good man*, preserving the Greek article, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; A good man, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; and so again in this verse. *his good treasure*, by an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; the good treasure of the heart, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *his evil treasure*, after Tynd. and Gen., the Greek article having a possessive force; the evil treasure, A. V. by a new rendering, the rest neglecting the article; see on 1, 24. — v. 36. *And* (δέ), after Wycl.; But, A. V. after the rest; and so Dr. Campbell (*however*), de Wette, Germ. Rev., Holl. Rev., Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. — v. 38. *of the scribes and Pharisees*, close to the Greek, after Rh.; of the scribes and of the Pharisees, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; see on 10, 18. *answered him*, by an addition to the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; answered, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen. — v. 39. *Jonah*; Jonas, A. V.; and so in vv. 40 and 41; see on 1, 2; *Jonah the prophet*, by a change of order to conform to the Greek; and so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg.; the prophet Jonas, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 40. *the belly of the whale*, after Dean Alford; this is the form of Wycl., Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Mr. Darby; the whale's belly, A. V. after the rest. — v. 41. *shall stand up*, after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes, nearly, will stand up; shall rise, A. V. after Wycl. and all. *in the judgement*, preserving the Greek article, after Cran. and Rh.; in judgement, A. V. after Gen. *for* (ὅτι here = γάρ), after Wycl., Tynd., and Gen.; because, A. V. after Cran. and Rh. — v. 42. *the ends*, after Wycl. and Rh.; the uttermost parts, A. V. by a new rendering; the utmost parties, Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 43. *But—when*, preserving the introductory particle, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; And when, Rh., the rest neglecting this particle. *the man*, preserving the Greek article, after Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; a man, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. *But the unclean spirit, when he is gone out of the man*, by a new order; when the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, A. V. according to the Greek, after Wycl. and all. *passeth*, after Sir John Cheke; walketh, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh.



*waterless places* : and so in the parallel passage, in S. Luke 11, 24, by a new rendering and the use of a word not Biblical, but which Richardson cites twice : *The sea* (shall be) *waterless*, Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt (d. 1552), Pickering's ed., p. 12 ; *places barain and waterlesse*, S. Luke 11, 24, Nich. Udall, Trans. of Erasmus' Paraphrase on the Gospels and the Acts (c. 1550) ; dry places, A. V., excellently, which all the ancient and modern versions have, except Dr. Campbell, parched deserts, which is also good but free. *findeth it not*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson ; *findeth not*, Wycl. and Rh. still closer ; *findeth none*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 44. *whence*, after Rh. ; *from whence*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, which is more rhythmical here. — v. 45. *more evil*, after Dr. Davidson ; *more wicked*, A. V. after Rh. *becometh*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson ; and so in effect Wycl. and Rh., *ben made*. — v. 46. *While he was yet speaking*, closer to the Greek, after Dr. Noyes and Mr. Darby ; and so nearly Rh., *As he was yet speaking*. *multitudes*, closer to the Greek, after Rh. ; *people*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *his* (ἡ) *mother*, the Greek article being used as a possessive ; *his mother*, A. V. ; see on 1, 24. *seeking to speak to him*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; *desiring to speak with him*, A. V. excellently, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 47. *And* (δέ) *one*, after Rh. ; *Then one*, A. V. freely, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *seeking to speak to thee*, after Mr. Darby ; *seeking to speak with thee*, Dr. Noyes ; *seeking thee*, Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulg. ; *desiring to speak with thee*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 49. *towards his*, after Dr. Campbell and Dr. Davidson ; *toward his*, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. ; and so Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford ; see on 5, 25. — v. 50. *he* (αὐτός) *is my brother, and sister, and mother*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; the harshness of this expression, unavoidable in Greek if the pronoun be expressed, is well avoided by A. V., *the same is my brother, and sister, and mother*, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. ; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson. This is merely allowing the translation the fair advantage of an English form, which the Revisers themselves have done in rendering the pronoun (οὗτος) in the parallel passage S. Mark 3, 35 ; see on 5, 19.

CHARLES SHORT.

## II.—ON THE ENGLISH DATIVE-NOMINATIVE OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUN.

The syntax of the personal pronoun in the second person has been treated by many writers ; but, so far as I know, the history of the singular dative-nominative has never been made the subject of special investigation. The grammars, at any rate, have little or nothing to say on the subject. Koch actually confounds dative and accusative ; cf. Zupitza's correction in the new edition (Cassel, 1878) of the second volume of the grammar, §324. Mätzner is interesting with regard to the impersonal verbs with datives (cf. below), but does not treat our subject directly. I have not Zupitza's note to a passage in *Guy of Warwick*, a note referred to in the grammar, treating of the dat.-nom. *you*. But with regard to the still earlier dat.-nom. for the *singular* of the second pers., there is nothing, that I am acquainted with, which bears directly on the subject. What here follows is mere sketch. The pressure of other work forbids any attempt on the writer's part to make a thorough study of the whole matter. Lack of material has prevented any consideration of the dialects.

First, we must connect the later change (*ye* to *you*, *i. e.* the formation of a plural dat.-nom.) with the earlier like tendency in the singular, notably the Kentish sing. dat.-nom. *pe* for *pu*. They result from the same cause. After the dative had driven out the acc. forms of the pers. pron. (cf. Koch, *Satzlehre*, §313, §314, §324), it turned toward the nominative. The dative, in fact, had long performed nominative functions. There is the well-known construction with *self*, as in Koch's example, *Leorna pe seolfa*, or in *Andreas*, 1348, *3d pe sylfa tó*. Besides the pers. pronouns, the definite article itself undoubtedly takes its rise from the dative form : cf. *mid pe king*, *of pe temple*, *on pe circe* ; and note to *Old Eng. Homilies* (Morris), p. xxxviii. In the Chronicle (ed. Earle, p. 260) we have the new nom. *pe king*, and the old nom. *se king*, within five lines of each other. The dat. in impersonal constructions, and the so-called ethical dative, we shall glance at below.

We turn to the regular dat.-nom. *pe* and *you*. As to the second, Zupitza shows (in his edition of Koch) that the dat.-nom. *you*

*waterless places* :

by a new rendering

Richardson cites

Thomas Wyatt

*and waterless*,

Paraphrase on

A. V., excell

have, except

but free. *for*

Dr. Davidson

none, A.V.

from where

mical here.

A. V. aft

Alford, M

Rh., be

Greek,

was y

people

ticle b

ing t

him,

one

Ge

wh

de

v.

h

the 15th century :

does occur so

England, the new

for example the

the second pers. is

the dat.-nom., so

rewarded. Take the

i. e. the two periods

1485 to 1509. The first

Piston Letters, shows as

almost *no* use) as the

however. In 1449, Margaret

if *ye* have another sone

William Tailboys, about

said to a prisoner before all

be hanged." A little later,

(No. 159) says: "*you* have

under Henry VII, the *ye* is

the earliest letters. More than

earlier stages of the language

nominative constructions: cf.

929) with Chaucer's *him luste*

(Vol. III, p. 370); *whane ye like*,

"*If thee well hadde liked*." It

thus: "Sir, ther arn XV jurores

"I pray *ye* that," etc., I 70.

we have the acc. "I pray *3w*." The

version, cited by Koch, is Shakspeare.

Chaucer. Cf. *Troilus and Cryseide*,

of Troilus to tellen . . .

er pat I parte froye.

Harleian 2280 has the same, *fro ye*.

fails to see this, and spoils the rime

Piston Letters from beginning to end,

them alone the prospects of our now

one would find little encouragement.

to 1509) there is not the slightest indica-

The most striking example of our dat.-

written about 1450; the later letters write

regularly *ye* for nom. But if we turn to the Kentish *Azenbite of Inwyt*, written (1340) a century before these letters, we find a use of the dat.-nom. in the second person of the *singular* pers. pron., that would justify the prophecy of a speedy substitution of *pe* for *pu*. It requires no very elaborate reasoning to prove that the singular was about to travel the same path that the plural trod later, was about to establish a dat.-nom. *thee*, as it afterwards established *you*. But just here began the change from singular to plural form. "Im Ne. (new English) gilt *ye* schon im 15 und 16 Jahr. als das höflichere," says Koch (p. 231). The singular was isolated. A hedge was set about it. It was reserved for solemn purposes, and was thus removed from the influence of linguistic change. It became one of those forms that men use *consciously*, with effort; just as we use *ye* with effort. Most men use any case of the singular pers. pron. second pers. only on especial occasions, and with this conscious effort.

Most men, but not all. Koch is mistaken when he says (§299) that *thou* is retained in "dem allgemeinen Gebrauch der Quäker." In point of fact, few members of the Society of Friends use *thou* in familiar speech. They use the *singular* in familiar speech, but, obedient to the tendency, it is the dat.-nom. *thee*, not *thou*. Just as *you* does service for all plural cases, so *thee* for the singular. This is well known to be the common household practice of Quakers. A few isolated exceptions only prove the rule. I have seen a familiar letter of an educated Friend, written in the early part of the 18th century, where the *thee* is used as nom., though any solemn passage calls out a formal *thou*. We shall see below what Dr. Abbott brings forward as reason for this Quaker practice. Then we have the dialects—a field whence I am shut out through lack of material. But any reader of George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, of *Tom Brown at Rugby* (early chapters), or of any such books, will recall a host of instances of this sing. dat.-nom. In the Eng. Gram. of Fiedler and Sachs (Leipz. 1877, p. 311) are noted such forms as *Thee bist* (Shropshire), *Thee wart* (Somerset and Wiltshire), as compared with the northern *Thou is*.

Now let us glance at Dr. Abbott's explanation of certain forms with *thee* used in Shakspeare. In his well-known *Shakespearian Grammar*, §212, he refers such expressions as "look thee," "hark thee," to the principle of *euphony*. "*Thee*, thus used," he says, "follows imperatives, which, being themselves emphatic, require an unemphatic pronoun. The Elizabethans reduced *thou* to *thee*."

þe ssoldest"; whereas, "to ham þet þou ssoldest"; (p. 52), "and þe sselt conne"; (p. 241), "þe sselt habbe"; whereas (p. 29), "þou sselt ywyte"; (p. 54), "yef þe wylt"; whereas (p. 101), "yef þou wylt"; (p. 73), "þe woldest þe rapre lete be ulaxe quik"; but (p. 146), "þet þou noldest"; (p. 90), "þis þi-self þe miȝt yzy"; but (p. 133), "þanne þou miȝt fruyt gaderi"; further (p. 187), "Vayre zone bi merciul as þe miȝt, yef þou hest ynoȝ of guode"; (p. 232), "do hardeliche alsuo moche ase þe miȝt . . . uor þou ne miȝt do no þing" . . . (p. 224), "þench ase moche ase þe miȝt"; (p. 269), "be auenture þe myȝt eft by onderuonge." The analogous confusion of þe and þec will occur to every one. Had þu and þe continued in common use, þe would have displaced þu, just as it previously displaced þec.

The modern Quaker *thee* does not take a verb to correspond. Where the Kentish has *þe sselt*, *þe multiplieth*, the modern forms are *thee shall*, *thee multiplies*. The reason is perhaps twofold. The northern form of the second pers. sing. of verbs (ending in -s) did its share. But the impersonal form of the verb with dative construction was a greater power. Thus the imp. form from P. Plow. already quoted: "If thee wel hadde liked," or Shoreham's "Levedy, the was wel wors."

As to general reasons for the usurpation of nominative functions by the dative case, we have no space here for inquiry. Perhaps we may bring to bear on the question Schleicher's remark at the close of his chapter on the personal pronoun (*Comp.* 4th ed. p. 641: "Es scheint als ob das deutliche hervortreten der stämme

I und !I person in den sprachen vermieden sei: vielleicht wir hierin eine art euphemismus zu erkennen, wie ja vieler sprachen eine scheu vor dem nennen des 'ich' und ich zeigt." Thus one prefers "me seems" to "I see." We : personal part in an oblique case, rather than in the nom. :atever the general reason, the tendency was helped by the y of the impersonal verbs in dative construction.

construction depends entirely on the inflexions. When become less and less used or understood, which is the case he progress of English, either the construction itself will to disuse, or else it will be otherwise understood. Take the sion "þe bihoueȝ godes helpe." þe is dative, *helpe* is geni- But such syntactical relations fall out of use. The common tanding is fain to take þe as a nominative, *helpe* as direct of the verb. Thus arises a dative-nominative; so to-day,

ninety-nine people out of a hundred understand *me thinks* as *I think*. Only with the second person, however, did this dative-nom. take firm hold. There was a tendency to change the case as well as the general construction. An interesting example occurs in Hen. VI, Part II, 3, 2. The king says: "Woe is me for Gloster, wretched man"; whereto the queen replies: "*Be woe for me*," understanding *thou*. So O. E. H. p. 31, "3if him is lap," but p. 35, "he is lap," and p. 39, "ne beo eow noht lap." Cf. also constructions in Past. Letters, quoted above. The much used impersonal constructions of Early English must have helped largely in the formation of a dative-nom. Mätzner gives a number of these. Thus (Orm. 2050) "þe birrþ ec hire taelenn"; (Joh. 16, 7) "éow fremap þæt ic fare"; (Cædm. 3649) "hú þé swefnade," etc. We may find expressions where a dat.-nom is still plainer. Thus Chaucer, Prol. to Wife of Bath's Tale, 329:

Have thou ynough, what thar the recch or care  
How merily that other folkes fare?

Frere's Tale, 67:

The thar no more as in this cas travayle.

Better still, Frere's Tale, 103:

If that the happe come into oure schire.

In O. E. H. 195 (*On god ureisun*, etc.) we have, "þet þe ne wontep." These sound like regular nom. constructions, and were in time so regarded. The verb was put sometimes in second pers. sing., showing that the impersonal construction was forgotten. Instructive here is the reading of the folios in Hamlet, V 2: "Does it not, *thinkst thee*, stand me now upon," and this is strengthened by the usage of many dialects (as opposed to the usage of Friends), as well as by such expressions as Defoe's "What *ailest thee* now?" (cf. Minto, Prose Manual, p. 409). Elworthy, in a paper in Trans. Phil. Soc. 1877-9, notes for West Somerset the form "Thee art."

But there are other forms, *e. g. thee are* (addressed to one person), a compromise between sing. and plur. sometimes heard. The most remarkable case I ever observed was where a lady, not a Friend, extended to several visitors, who were of that sect, an invitation as follows: "Won't *thee all* walk into this room?"

The "ethical dative," finally, did its part to help the dat.-nom. We know how familiar the former was in O. E. poetry. Thus



### III.—PARTICIPIAL PERIPHRASES IN ATTIC PROSE.

Not infrequently in classic Greek we find the combination of a participle with *εἶναι* or *γίγνεσθαι* used when a finite form of the verb represented by the participle might rather have been expected. Such phenomena have nowhere received, I believe, any exhaustive treatment, so that the force of these periphrases has not been clearly determined, much less have the limits of these combinations been fixed either for the whole range of classic Greek or for individual authors. It is true the subject has been incidentally treated in the grammars and commentaries, but such treatment has been based on a range of examples at once too wide and too narrow, and without regard to the very different categories under which they fall. In consequence the deductions are uniformly loose and inadequate, sometimes erroneous and contradictory.<sup>1</sup> Those who see

<sup>1</sup> Kühner (II, §353, 3) says: "Um dem Prädikate ein grösseres Gewicht zu geben, zerlegt die Sprache zuweilen den einfachen Verbal-ausdruck desselben in das Partizip und die Kopula *εἶναι*." Again, "Häufig ist sie auch in der Attischen Prosa wenn eine Handlung als bleibender Zustand bezeichnet werden soll." He also notes the frequency in Plato of *ἔχων εἶναι*. (He should rather have said *εἶναι ἔχων*, 23 cases against 10.) Bernhardt, on the other hand (Syntax, p. 334), considers such expressions are "ohne eine gewählteren Sinn (wie die Lateinische Formel dieser Art) oder den Ausdruck der Dauer den man in einzelnen Phrasen, worunter das Platonische *εἶναι ἔχων*, zuweilen beabsichtigte. Aber ein *ὄν* neben Participien vermied man als zwecklose Härte und so erkennt man in solchen Stellungen nicht sowohl die participiale als adjective Bedeutung." Krüger (§56) cites indiscriminately a number of examples without offering any explanation. Madvig (I quote from the English translation) says: "Some few present participles, viz., *διαφέρων*, *ἔχων* with an adverb, *προσέκων*, *πρέπων*, *δέον*, *ἐξόν*, *συμφέρον*, sometimes occur as adjective predicate nouns, with *εἰμί*, or *γίγνομαι*, occasionally also others in connection with an actual adjective." Again, "A participle of the present or aorist with *εἰμί*, as a periphrasis of the simple tense of the verb (in like manner as the partic. pf. under certain circumstances is joined to *εἰμί*) is a poetical licence of not very frequent occurrence; in the prose passages where it does occur there is apt to be a certain emphasis in the several and distinct expression of the action (the partic.) and its existence (*εἰμί*)." Classen, in his Thucyd. (Anhang, Bk. I, 1, 1) draws attention to the different character of these combinations according to the position of *εἶναι*, and observes that only adjectivized participles are used in this way in Thucydides.





Here then is the clue to the differentiation of *λύει* and *λύων ἐστί*. In the latter case we have an adjective and a copular verb, and hence a permanent quality predicated of the subject; in the former we have an activity or series of activities predicated. This principle we shall find as we proceed to include what fragments of the truth the opinions already quoted contain, and will account for the phenomena they note. But to give definiteness to our results it will be well to throw the cases into their natural categories and then examine each group by itself. It is manifest, in the first place, that the participles of the several tenses do not lend themselves with equal readiness to this use. It will therefore be advantageous to treat separately periphrases into which present, aorist and perfect participles respectively enter.<sup>1</sup> Again, since *εἶναι* in an emphatic position may cease to be purely copular and come to contain the predicate within itself, we will separate cases in which the *εἶναι* (*γίγνεσθαι*) follows the participle from those in which it precedes, and, for convenience, will term the former periphrases of the *First Form*, the latter of the *Second Form*.

#### PRESENT PARTICIPLE. *First Form.*

Under this head we have to consider such periphrases as *λύων ἐστί*, which, according to the principle just laid down, asserts the existence of a certain quality in the subject in contradistinction to the predication of an action or series of actions on the part of the subject. Supposing this to be true, is there any demand in the language for periphrases with such a function? There is, provided the language has not an adjective already formed for the expression of every conception which under any circumstances might possibly come to be regarded as a quality. A stock of adjectives sufficient to cover such a proviso, the language of course does not possess. There are, in the first place, certain verbs in Greek expressing the manifestation of a quality while at the same time no adjective exists for the expression of the quality itself. Such verbs, *e. g.*, as *προσῆκειν*, *πρέπειν* (cf. Lat. *convenit*, *decet*, and Eng. 'becomes,' 'befits'), *διαφέρειν*, *συμφέρειν* and *ὁμολογεῖσθαι*. In each of these cases the quality in question has no existence in a single object but in relation to two objects, and the coming together of the two objects was, by the earlier language-users, regarded as the

<sup>1</sup> The fut. partic. scarcely occurs. I have noted one case, Pl. Tim. 38 B, where the periphrasis results from symmetry.

## 'HILOLOGY.

if this view is confirmed  
*new, convenit*, 'becomes.'  
 e quality apart from its  
 d to express this quality  
 oloyed. Meanwhile the  
 nd the distinct notion of  
 at in the main the mani-  
*κα* is equivalent to the

ases, the language often  
 1 of a verb as a quality,  
 rb naturally lends itself  
 ls an example; *ἀν δὲ γε*  
 opined is *erroneous*";  
 is in the main a fiction,  
 nce of a quality as of a  
 l. Isoc. Epist. 9, 13; Pl.  
 f the type *ἀμαρτανόμενον*  
 cond class, since, while  
 thoroughly adjectivized  
 he peculiarity of having  
 nders the use of the

ples as have nothing in  
 be used as adjectives,  
 these periphrases: *e. g.*

*πάνθ' ἡμῖν τὰ τῶν νόμων*  
 tended to bring before  
 a characteristic of the  
*οὐκοῦν εὐδαιμονίστατοι καὶ*  
*δημοτικήν τε καὶ πολιτικήν*  
 jective clearly indicates  
 oted that characteristic  
 of continuance, which  
 tion or quality, for this  
 ertion of the existence

an be discovered in the use  
 articiples are so thoroughly  
 ut it may occasionally be  
*ων; ΑΔ. Ναί. ΣΩ. Τὰ δίκαια*

of the corresponding characteristic or quality in the subject. The finite form includes the periphrastic; not conversely. The finite form has other functions and lacks definiteness; the periphrastic is an accurate expression for the existence of an aptitude or tendency, not necessarily manifesting itself, but, it may be, merely potential. The conception, however, of a quality apart from its manifestation is an abstraction, very necessary to the philosophic thinker, but not likely to be much used in practical life, where acts, not potentially existent tendencies, are of prime importance.

In the following list of occurrences in the Orators of periphrases of the first form containing a present partic., such cases as Dem. 3, 25 are kept by themselves: οὕτω σώφρονες ἦσαν καὶ σφόδρα ἐν τῇ πολιτείας ἡθελ μένοντες ὥστε . . . Here the participle is parallel to an adjective<sup>1</sup> which precedes it, and by that parallelism at the same time the function of the participle is clearly indicated and any harshness there may be in the combination is mitigated.

ἀναδεχόμενος, Dem. 19, 37; ἀρκῶν (4 times), Ant. 2, β, 2; 2, γ, 3; 2, δ, 10; 4, γ, 6;<sup>2</sup> δημοκρατούμενος, Dem. 24, 5; διαφέρων (7), Ant. 5, 88; 6, 6; Isoc. 7, 45; 12, 120; Epist. 2, 3; Aesch. 3, 162; 3, 168; ἐκστρατευόμενοι, Lycurg. 107; ἔχων (2), Isoc. Epist. 9, 13; Dem. 31, 11; ὁμολογούμενος (5), Isoc. 6, 14; Isae. 2, 40; Din. 1, 90; Lycurg. 36; Dem. 20, 32; ποιούμενος, Dem. 19, 37; πρέπων (6), Lys. 3, 9; 19, 59; Isoc. 6, 90; 15, 74; Epist. 5, 3; 6, 7; προσήκων (5), Isoc. 12, 124; Isae. 7, 14; Dem. 45, 49; 69; 48, 6; συμφέρων (8), Lys. 12, 7; Isoc. 14, 25; Epist. 5, 3; Lycurg. 37; Dem. 16, 10; 19, 75; 161; 24, 24.<sup>3</sup>

Total number of cases 41, in which 11 different participles appear. In addition to these we have 25 cases where the participle is parallel to a preceding adjective:

Isoc. 6, 72 (ἀρμόττοντα); 8, 36 (προσήκον); 12, 183 (πρέπων); 15, 47 (δυνάμενος); 77 (πρέπων); 91 (δυνάμενος); 187 (διαφέρων); Aesch. 3, 28\*<sup>4</sup> (λύων); 1, 141 (περιφρονῶν); Dem. 3, 25 (μένων); 19, 25 (ὑπερβάλλων); 20, 8 (πρέπον); 55\* (ποιοῦντες); 153 (καλῶς ἔχων); 157 (κακῶς ἔχων); 21, 66 (συμφέρον); 201\* (μέγα φρονῶν, μέγα φθεγγόμενος);

<sup>1</sup> In some cases a noun, with of course no essential difference (*vid.* Pl. Sym. 191 D). I also include those cases in which a pf. participle precedes.

<sup>2</sup> ἀρχων is conjectured [And.] 4, 30. Since it has become a noun I have not noted all occurrences of this word.

<sup>3</sup> In this and following lists κείμενος and its compds. are not included, inasmuch as they were regarded and treated as pfs.

<sup>4</sup> In the cases marked thus \* the copula is not expressed.



1, 38, 4 is worthy of note, since there ἀρέσκοντές ἐσμεν and ἀπαρέσκοιμεν ἄν are used side by side, the former of an abiding quality which characterized the relations of the Corinthians and their colonies, whilst the latter refers to certain special acts. To the limitation of periphrases to adjectivized participles there may be one exception, unless Cobet's emendation of μεταπεπεμμένοι for MS μεταπεμπόμενοι be adopted. As the passage stands, there is, according to the principles enunciated here, no fitness in the periphrasis; but a slight change of the masc. to neuter ending, -οι to -α, would bring it into accord with them, and the meaning would be 'such things as were imported.' But, as there is nowhere else in Thucy. so striking a case of periphrasis, I would prefer Cobet's reading.<sup>1</sup>

I now pass to a list of the occurrences in Plato: αἰσθανόμενος (4), Theaet. 159 E; 160 B (*ter*); ἀγόμενον (2), Euthyph. 10 B (*bis*); ἀμαρτανόμενον, Phil. 37 E; ἀνομολογούμενος, Gorg. 495 A; ἀποπληρῶν, Nom. 932 B; ἀρμόττων, Nom. 808 B; ἄρχων (2), Rep. 558 D; Tim. 44 A; ἀρχόμενος, Nom. 715 D; βλέπων, Nom. 963 A; γιγνόμενος (6), Euthyph. 10 C (*bis*): Craty. 411 D; Phil. 42 D; Hip. Maj. 297 C; Nom. 935 D; δεόμενος, Nom. 768 E; δέον (7), Nom. 649 C (*bis*); 793 E; 796 C; 800 E; 802 DE; Epin. 990 C; διαφέρων (8), 719 D; 720 E; 729 C; 743 C; 779 E; 794 D; 901 B; Epin. 987 C; διαφθειρόμενος, Rep. 492 A; διαφθείρων, Rep. 492 A; δρῶν, Tim. 33 D; ἐγγιγνόμενος, Theaet. 187 D; ἐλλείπων (2), Theaet. 157 E; Nom. 960 D; ἐπιτρέπων, Nom. 932 B; ἐπόμενος (6), Pol. 271 B; Rep. 412 B; 461 E; Tim. 42 A; 54 D; Nom. 716 D; ἔχων (10), Craty. 386 D; 391 A; Soph. 253 C; Parm. 165 A; Tim. 66 A; Nom. 713 B; 735 D; 798 E; 860 E; 967 A; ἐχόμενα, Nom. 828 A; ἡγεμονοῦν, Nom. 631 C; θηριούμενος, Nom. 935 A; κακουργῶν, Nom. 933 A; κατέχων, Tim. 52 B; κινούμενα, Soph. 249 B; λεγόμενος, Nom. 719 C; λειπόμενον, Nom. 807 A; λυσιτελῶν, Nom. 662 C; μαινόμενος (2), Prot. 350 B; Nom. 934 C; μετέχον (2), Tim. 58 D; Nom. 859 E; μισοῦντες, Nom. 908 B; ὁμολογούμενος (2), Craty. 387 D; Phil. 12 A; ὁμονοῶν, Nom. 759 B; ὀρώμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 B (*bis*); Tim. 56 C; Epin. 984 E; ὀρῶν, Theaet. 164 A; ὀφειλόμενος, Rep. 332 A; ὀφλῶν, Nom. 909 B; παρεπόμενος, Nom. 667 D; παρέχων, Tim. 33 D; πάσχων (4), Euthyph. 10 C (*bis*); Theaet. 157 A; Tim. 33 CD; ποιοῦν, Theaet. 157 A; πρέπων (23), Lach. 188 D; Gorg. 504 A; Hip. Maj. 291 C; Tim. 21 A; 33 B; Critias 112 B; 117 A; Nom. 665 D; 670 D; 755 C; 764 C; 779 C (*bis*); 796 C;

<sup>1</sup> Herbst (pp. 37-9) attacks Cobet's emendation, but fails egregiously in making his point.

800 E; 801 E; 804 E; 818 A; 855 A; 917 A; 920 E; 950 C; 956 A; προσήκων (10), Phil. 36 D; Phaedr. 227 C; Rep. 404 A; 442 D; 525 B; Nom. 713 C; 724 B; 751 B; 775 A; 904 E; συμφέρων (6), Phil. 63 A; Alcib. I 114 E; 116 D; Hip. Maj. 290 C (*dis*); Ion 540 C; συνεπόμενος (2), Critias 117 A; Nom. 858-9 A; συνέχοντα, Soph. 253 C; τιθέμενος, Nom. 822 E; ὑπάρχων (4), Rep. 458 A; Nom. 774 C; 846 E; 923 D; φερόμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 B (*ter*); Soph. 249 B; φιλούμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 A; C (*dis*); D; χαίρων, Alcib. II 139 C; ὤν (5), Soph. 240 B; 245 C; 256 D; 263 B; Tim. 38 B.

Total number of cases 151, in which 53 different partic. occur. In addition we have 58 cases where a parallel adj. precedes:

Euthyph. 5 D (ἔχον); Apol. 40 A (ἐναντιουμένη); Phaedo 82 A (ιόντες); Craty. 408 C\* (οἰκοῦν); 440 A (ἔχον); Theaet. 178 C (πυρέττων); 182 B (αἰσθανόμενος); Soph. 225 A\* (πρέπον); 229 D (ἔχον); Parm. 144 A (μετέχων); 145 A\* (ἔχον); 150 A (περιέχουσα); 159 A\* (κινούμενα); 166 B\* (ἀπτόμενα); Symp. 175 E (ἔχουσα); 206 D (ἀρμόττον); Alcib. II 139 D (παιόμενος καὶ βαλλόμενος); Anter. 135 B (προσῆκον); Charm. 169 E (γινώσκων) *dis*; Lach. 188 D (ἀρμόττον); Prot. 349 D (διαφέρων); Gorg. 493 E (ἐκποριζόμενα); Meno 72 B (διαφέρων); Hip. Maj. 289 E (ἀποδεχόμενος); Rep. 423 C (δοκοῦσα); 441 E (πράττων); 524 B (δεόμενα); 552 E (ἔχων); 568 A (διαφέρων); 571 C\* (ἄρχον); 577 E (πενόμενος); 596 D\* (δημιουργούμενος); Tim. 36 E\* (μετέχων); 44 D (δεσποτοῦν); 87 C\* (πρέπον); Nom. 625 A\* (πρέπον); 666 E (δυνάμενος); 716 D (πρέπον); 723 C (διαφέρον); 732 B (λεγόμενα); 747 C (προσῆκον); 763 D (σχολάζων); 765 A (ἀποδιδούς); 775 D\* (ἐχόμενα); 781 D (πρέπων); 798 D (δεόμενα); 821 A (συμφέρον); 837 B\* (ἔχον); 875 D (ἄρχων); 875 E (διαφέρον); 876 C\* (ἔχον); 892 BC (ἀρχόμενα); 976 D (ἄρχων, ἀρχόμενος); Epin. 981 E (ὀρώμενα); 992 C\* (μετέχων).

It is Plato who affords the best field for the investigation of these forms, inasmuch as he employs them not only with accuracy but with freedom. In Euthyphro the argument hinges on the distinction between φιλούμενόν ἐστι and φιλεῖται. Euthyphro has defined (9 E) τὸ ὅσιον as 'that which the gods love.' Whereupon Socrates asks, "Is that which is holy, loved by the gods, because it is holy, or holy, because it is loved by the gods?" and illustrates his meaning thus; τὸ φερόμενον, διότι φέρεται, φερόμενόν ἐστιν . . . οὐκ ἄρα διότι ὀρώμενόν γέ ἐστι, διὰ τοῦτο ὀράται, ἀλλὰ τουναντίον διότι ὀράται, διὰ τοῦτο ὀρώμενον, *i. e.* 'It is not because a thing possesses the quality of visibility, that it is seen, but because it is seen, the quality of visi-

bility is predicated of it.' He then makes the general statement : *εἴ τι γίγνεται ἢ τι πάσχει τι, οὐχ ὅτι γιγνόμενόν ἐστι, γίγνεται ἀλλ' ὅτι γίγνεται, γιγνόμενόν ἐστιν : οὐδ' ὅτι πάσχον ἐστί, πάσχει, ἀλλ' ὅτι πάσχει, πάσχον ἐστίν.* This simply asserts that we predicate the general characteristic or quality in consequence of the several concrete manifestations, and not conversely. We have not space to pursue the argument, but this suffices to illustrate the use Plato makes of periphrases in philosophic discussion. And so frequently, *e. g.* Soph. 249 B, *φερόμενα καὶ κινούμενα πάντ' εἶναι, ἰ. ε.* 'All things are *capable of* motion'; Theaet. 159 E foll. *αἰσθανόμενος γίγνομαι*, 'I become perceptive.' Note especially Tim. 56 C where *δρώμενόν [ἐστιν]* is used of what is capable of being seen, and *δρᾶσθαι* of what is actually seen ; also the frequent employment of *ὄν* to express the highest philosophic reality or absolute truth, *e. g.* Soph. 256 D ; again, *ποιοῦν* and *πάσχον* (agent and patient), Theaet. 157 A. But, apart from the absolute needs of scientific accuracy, Plato employs these periphrases freely. There are, in the 151 cases, 49 into which participles of the first group enter. In the second group we may place *δίων* (7 times), *δεομένη* (1), *ἐλλείπων* (2), *ὑπάρχων* (4), *λειπόμενος* (1), *ἔχων* (10), *ἐχόμενα*<sup>1</sup> (1), and the following used in an adjective sense, *όμονοῶν* (1), *συνεπόμενος* (2), *ἀνομολογούμενος* (1), *κακουργῶν* (1), *λυσιτελῶν* (1), *μαινόμενος* (2), *ἀμαρτανόμενον* (1), *ἀρμόττων* (1), *χαίρων*, 'scot-free' (1), *ἐπόμενος* (6), *ῶν*<sup>2</sup> (5), *θηριούμενος* (1), *αἰσθανόμενος*<sup>3</sup> (4), *δρώμενος*<sup>3</sup> (4), *ἄρχων* (2), *ἀρχόμενος* (1), *λεγόμενος*, 'traditional' (1).<sup>4</sup> For typical examples *vid.* Critias 117 A ; Prot. 350 B ; Nom. 715 D.

Some 40 cases still remain to be disposed of and these will fall into our third group, where, since the adj. character is not stamped on the partic. itself, it is necessary to quote the context in order to show the force of the periphrasis ; this space does not permit, and I will have to limit myself to one or two cases. Nom. 822 DE, *οὐ γὰρ ἄρρητά φαμεν εἶναι, λέγοντες τὰ αὐτὰ ὡς νόμους οἷεσθαι τιθεμένους εἶναι πολλῆς ἀνοίας γέμειν, ἰ. ε.* "For we do not say that such subjects are not to be spoken of at all, when we say it is a great absurdity to consider them, like laws, *to be matters such as are to be laid down in legislation.*" Rep. 332 A, *καίτοι γε ὀφειλόμενόν πού ἐστι τοῦτο, δ παρακατέθετο.* Nom. 935 D, *ὅποταν θυμῷ γιγνόμενον ᾗ*, "whenever it is of the kind that is done in anger." *γιγνόμενον* is frequent

<sup>1</sup> Nom. 828 A, where it is quite colorless.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned above.

<sup>3</sup> Nom. 719 C., cf. 782 D, Tim. 21 A.

<sup>4</sup> So I read instead of *τε*, which involves a clumsy anacoluthon (Stall. ad loc.) The variations in text do not affect the periphrasis.



in periphrases in the sense of 'phenomenon,' *vid.* Hip. Maj. 297 C. There seems to be a tendency to use *γινόμενον* where it is not absolutely required, *vid.* Theaet. 187 D, Phil. 42 D. These two passages are, of all that I have found, the least satisfactorily accounted for by the theory. For further examples see Tim. 33 C, 52 B, 58 D (cf. Nom. 859 E), Soph. 253 C, Rep. 492 D, Craty. 411 D, Nom. 667 D, 631 C, 909 B, etc. In all cases it will be found that the main object of the writer is to describe or characterize, not to assert particular acts. It will be remembered that the periphrastic form is not absolutely necessary; sometimes finite and periphr. appear side by side, Nom. 932 AB; 908 B. Symmetry of structure is occasionally a factor, Theaet. 164 A; in one long sentence (Parm. 157 AB), consisting of corresponding clauses, it has brought about the employment of the periphrasis where, according to the theory here advanced, the periphrasis ought not to be used. Two other passages which do not harmonize with the theory, Hip. Maj. 286 B and Cleit. 410 A, are accounted for by the post-classical date of these dialogues (*vid.* Gildersleeve's Justin Martyr, p. 143).<sup>1</sup>

### *Second Form.*

When *εἶναι* (*γίγνεσθαι*) is thrown into an emphatic position it ceases to be a colorless copula, and acquires a new force which varies according to circumstances. But the position of *εἶναι* before the partic. may be merely incidental, so that it acquires no emphasis, and in this case (*a*) the periphrasis does not at all differ from those already examined; nor need the second form differ from the first, when the *εἶναι* becomes merely an emphatic copula. On the other hand, if full stress is given, the mind dwells on the *εἶναι* rather than on the partic., and in it we must look for the *raison d'être* of the periphrasis. Characterization, if it exists, in such a case is wholly secondary. The resolution into periphrasis arises from the mind's being occupied with the *εἶναι* factor; the participle comes in afterwards to complete the sense. Under this head we have two categories, either (*b*) the *εἶναι* is an emphatic assertion, 'is really,'

<sup>1</sup> Not every passage where *εἶναι* and a partic. come together is to be considered periphr., e. g. Gorg. 469 D (quotation), Craty. 405 (exigencies of etymology), Phil. 48 D (corrupt). Elsewhere the partic. may be construed separately, and here differences of opinion may arise. I give the excluded passages which offer most room for doubt: Rep. 502 D; Pol. 29 C, cf. B; Gorg. 523 B; Nom. 822 C; 871 C; 909 E; Phil. 33 B.

'actually,' or (*c*) contains a predicate in itself, meaning 'exists,' or in the case of *γίγνεσθαι* 'comes into being.' The construction of the participle here is analogous to that which it has with *φαίνομαι*, and shades off into the ordinary use of a participle of circumstance, so that it may be a matter of doubt whether the participle depends on the subject immediately or through the verb. It is manifest then that while cases under the head of *a* will have the same limitations as in the first form, those in *b*, and more especially in *c*, will be used more freely without limitations as to the nature of the participle. We noted, under the first form, the tendency towards periphrasis in verbs like *ἔχων* which express a permanent condition. Since the emphasizing of *εἶναι* gives still more prominence to the idea of existence and permanence, we may expect to find such verbs even more frequently in periphr. of the second form.

The following is the list of occurrences in the Orators: *ἀμφισβητῶν*, Isoc. 15, 57; *ἐπαυξάνοντα*, Dem. 3, 33; *ἔχων* (6), Isoc. 5, 110; 15, 117; Din. 1, 90; Dem. 20, 18; 113; 23, 73; *λεγόμενος*, Isoc. 12, 119; *ὁμολογούμενος* (3), Isae. 1, 38; 8, 20; Dem. 55, 19; *παρακαλῶν*, Isoc. 15, 57; *περιόν*, Dem. 36, 8; *πρέπων*, Isoc. 5, 110; *προσῆκων* (6), Isoc. 5, 110; 15, 188; Dem. 3, 24; 4, 38; 21, 196; 22, 33; *συμφέρων* (3), Isoc. 5, 16; Lycurg. 140; Aesch. 2, 57; *ὑπάρχων* (3), Lys. 13, 91; Aesch. 3, 208; Dem. 20, 25; *ὑποδεχόμενος*, Dem. 55, 19; *ὑπολειπόμενος*, Dem. 50, 24.

Total 29, in which 13 different participles are used.

There are 14 additional cases where an adjective precedes: Andoc. 1, 4 (*ὑπάρχων*);<sup>1</sup> Isoc. 12, 135 (*προσῆκων*); Epist. 9, 19 (*συμφέρον*); Dem. 19, 202 (*προσῆκων*); 294 (*δεόμενα*); 312 (*μισῶν*); 20, 94 (*συμφέρον*); 21, 70 (*προσῆκων*); 114 (*διορίζων*); 185 (*ἐλεῶν*, *ὑβρίζων*); 22, 73 (*ἔχων*); 24, 181 (*ἔχων*); 29, 13 (*προσποιούμενος*).

Since space is lacking to discuss cases which exhibit peculiarities similar to those of the first form, it will suffice to cite an example of the emphatic copula in connection with a partic. which is clearly characterizing: Dem. 3, 33, *ἀλλ' ἔστι ταῦτα τὴν ἐκάστου ῥαθυμίαν ἐπαυξάνοντα*. Also Isoc. 15, 57; 117. Let us rather note some cases where the periphrasis has arisen, not from the desire to characterize, but from the need of employing the other factor of the combination. Aesch. 3, 208, *δνοῖν θάτερον ὑπάρχει δεῖ, ὣν οὐδέτερόν ἐστι Δημοσθένει ὑπάρχον*. Cf. Dem. 20, 25; Lys. 13, 91. Again, Isae. 1, 38, *ἡμᾶς δ' οἷς ἐστὶν ἀμφοτέρα ταῦτα παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογούμενα . . .*

<sup>1</sup> MSS read in this passage also *διδομένη*, which cannot stand. Some editors strike it out altogether, better read *δεδομένη*.

Or Dem. 50, 24, οὐκ ἔστι πρόφασις ὑπολειπομένη, cf. 55, 19. In this last cited case the participle is quite secondary, but is yet predicate. Such a construction can of course be used with perfect freedom and we are far from the periphrases with which we started. In Thucydides there are some good illustrations of the secondary character of the partic.; 4, 109, 2; 8, 69, 3; 2, 80, 3. In 2, 67, 1 and 8, 92, 4, the participles may be taken independently of the verb as in the ordinary participial construction, or perhaps less naturally as predicates. In 1, 99, 2, characterization predominates.

Let us turn now to Plato. The following is the list of occurrences: ἀγνοῶν, Phaedr. 239 B; ἄγων, Phaedr. 237 D; αἰσθανόμενος, Theaet. 159 E; ἀκουόμενος, Tim. 26 BC; ἀντιτιθέμενος, Soph. 257 D; ἀποδιδόμενος, Nom. 768 A; ἄρχων, Phaedr. 237 D; γέμων, Nom. 807 C; γιγνόμενος (16), Euthyph. 5 E; Pol. 301 D; Parm. 152 B; Phil. 39 A; 39 C; 42 A; Phaedr. 274 A; Lys. 213 C; Prot. 356 A; Tim. 38 B; Nom. 729 B; 800 C; 805 E; 901 C; 959 E; Epin. 985 B; δεόμενος, Nom. 913 A; δέον (2), Tim. 42 D; Nom. 713 B; διαδιδόμενος, Tim. 77 E; διαιρούμενος, Nom. 895 E; διαφέρων (7), Parm. 154 D; Alcib. II 149 B; Gorg. 500 C; Nom. 696 B; 733 BC; 861 B; 963 B; δοκῶν, Phil. 51 A; δοξάζων, Soph. 240 D; δυνάμενος, Nom. 937 E; ἐλλειπόμενος, Soph. 258 B; ἐνών, Rep. 431 E; ἐπιμελούμενος, Epin. 980 D; ἐπιτηδευόμενος, Rep. 527 B; ἐπόμενος, Nom. 763 C; ἔχων (23), Phaedo 92 D; Soph. 258 B; 287 E; 297 E; Pol. 306 B; Phil. 48 C; 59 B; Phaedr. 245 E; Prot. 330 E; Gorg. 484 A; Meno 82 C (*bis*); Hip. Min. 368 E; Rep. 397 B; 602 C; Nom. 663 D; 743 A; 747 D; 770 C; 857 B; 876 E; 892 C; 896 A; καλούμενος, Nom. 961 D; κινούμενος, Theaet. 153 D; λεγόμενος (11), Soph. 257 D; Pol. 302 C; Phil. 11 B; 26 E; Rep. 490 A; 588 B; Tim. 90 E; Nom. 773 C; 855 A; 881 B; Epin. 981 A; μέλον, Nom. 766 C; μετέχων (3), Pol. 273 B; Parm. 141 A; Rep. 396 E; μεταβάλλων, Nom. 894 E; νομοθετούμενος, Nom. 834 B; νομοθετοῦντες, Nom. 692 B; νοσοῦντες, Alcib. II 139 D; οἰκνύμενος, Rep. 521 A; δρώμενος, Epin. 985 B; παρεπόμενος, Theag. 128 D; παρών, Phaedr. 272 A; περιέχων, Parm. 138 A; περιφερόμενος, Rep. 402 D; ποιούμενος, Theaet. 143 D; πολιτευόμενος, Nom. 676 B; ποριζόμενος, Rep. 364 B; πρέπων (8), Tim. 17 B; Nom. 627 C; 756 B; 767 B; 931 D; 944 E; 945 B; 948 C; πρεσβευόμενος, Nom. 879 C; πραττόμενος (2), Nom. 736 B; 870 D; προσήκων, Nom. 902 C; συμφέρων, Rep. 338 D; συνοικῶν, Nom. 848 A; τείνων (2), Pol. 308 E; Meno 84 B; τιθέμενος, Nom. 963 A; ὑπερέχων, Nom. 696 B; φέρων (2), Nom. 811 B; Alcib. II

142 B; *ψυχόμενος*, *Phaedo* 118 A; *ᾧν* (15), *Soph.* 237 A; 245 D; 256 E; 259 A; *Parm.* 141 A; 162 A (*τερ*); *Phil.* 51 A; *Phaedr.* 247 E; *Tim.* 38 BC (*δὲς*); 61 D; *Nom.* 771 C; 894 A.

133 cases in which 53 different participles are used.

There are 14 additional cases where an adj. precedes: *Soph.* 258 C (*δν*); *Parm.* 141 A (*ἔχον*); 141 E (*μετέχον*); *Symp.* 191 D (*ἐπιχειρῶν*); *Alcib.* I 114 B (*συμφέρον*); 116 DE (*συμφέρον*); *Meno* 99 E (*παραγιγνομένη*); *Rep.* 374 E (*δεόμενον*); 556 A (*ἀναγκάζων*); *Critias* 112 A (*ἔχων*); *Nom.* 649 D (*γέμων*); 840 AB (*σφριγῶντες*); 918 C (*δεόμενον*); *Epin.* 981 E (*ἔχον*).

The number of these latter cases is small as compared with the similar ones in the first form, an indication of the less uniformly adjective character of periphrases in the second form. A further confirmation of this is to be had from a comparison of the most frequently recurring participles in each form. These are for the first, the thoroughly adjectivized:

	<i>πρέπων</i>	<i>προσέκων</i>	<i>διαφέρων</i>	<i>συμφέρων</i>	<i>Total.</i>
1st Form	23	10	8	6	47
2d "	8	1	7	1	17

For the second:

	<i>ἔχων</i>	<i>γιγνόμενος</i>	<i>ῶν</i>	<i>λεγόμενος</i>	<i>Total.</i>
2d Form	23	16	15	11	65
1st "	10	6	5	1	22

The recurrence of *ἔχων* illustrates the tendency of this form to express an abiding condition. The frequent employment of *γιγνόμενος* and *ᾧν* arises from the fact that in Plato's time these two words represented fundamentally opposing views of the universe, which Plato made it his business to reconcile. If it were needful to use *γίγνεσθαι* of something which had real existence, the speaker, to avoid ambiguity, must employ *εἶναι* in the emphatic position with *γιγνόμενος*, *e. g.* *Tim.* 38 B; *Parm.* 152 B. Again, were it necessary to speak of a thing coming into real existence, *γίγνεσθαι* would have to be used in the emphatic position with *ᾧν*; *e. g.* *Soph.* 237 A; 245 D. Finally, even more frequently, lest *εἶναι* should be taken in the loose popular sense, *εἶναι δν* is employed in reference to absolute existence, *e. g.* *Phaedr.* 247 D. The periphrases of these participles, however, are not confined to questions of 'being'; *Prot.* 356 A, *Pol.* 301 D. The cases in which *λεγόμενος* appears arise from the need of using a pregnant *εἶναι*. *Nom.* 881 B, *ἔστιν δὲ λεγόμενον τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο τῇδε*. Here there is no

emphasis on the *act*, but to an abiding condition, "Let the next topic stand expressed in the following way." Nom. 773 F, *περὶ γάμων δὴ ταῦτ' ἔστω παραμύθια λεγόμενα*, "Let these things be granted to be," etc. Rep. 588 B, *ἦν δέ που λεγόμενον*, "It was laid down in the course of the discussion" (cf. use of *ἦν* in Aristotle, etc., of a definition which has been arrived at and still holds). Rep. 490 A; Pol. 302 C; Tim. 90 E. Somewhat different are Phil. 11 B; 26 E, cf. Nom. 961 D; Soph. 257 D. In Nom. 855 A *λεγόμενος* is added as an afterthought. Other examples of pregnant use of *εἶναι* are Nom. 763 C and 770 C (where *ἦν* is used of a conclusion reached in a former part of the discussion); Nom. 959 E, *ἔστω πρότερα ἡμῖν τὰ περὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὄντα*, "Let us presuppose that bodily and spiritual things really exist," cf. 963 A. It is *ἔστι* that gives the *raison d'être* of the periphr. in Nom 895 E, *ἔστι που δίχα διαιρούμενον* . . . "There exists a twofold division," cf. Tim. 77 E. The participle is quite secondary in such passages as Rep. 431 E, *ἐν ταύτῃ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο ἐνόν*, cf. Soph. 257 D; Nom. 870 D. To show the entirely secondary place which characterization may have in this form, we cite Nom. 692 B, *τοῖς τότε νομοθέταις, οἵτινες ἄρ' ἦσαν νομοθετοῦντες*, for, if the idea of characterization were the main one, the relative clause would be tautological, but it is in *ἦσαν* we find the reason for the periphrasis, "the lawgivers who *were actually* engaged in legislation." Again in Phaedo 118 A, *ἦν ψυχόμενα*, 'was actually growing cold,' is used antithetically to the jailer's assertion as to what would take place. In one case, Nom. 768 A, I cannot satisfactorily account for the periphr. unless there be an anacoluthon. The other passages least easily accounted for are Euthyph. 5 E; Nom. 729 B; 800 C.<sup>1</sup>

I will conclude the discussion of periphrases containing the present partic. with a summary as regards the use of these combinations in the authors examined. Periphrases of the first form, as well as of the second form in as far as they resemble the others in function, were not employed in ordinary speech except in the case of certain thoroughly adjectivized participles, to which the few cases found in Lysias, Andocides and Isocrates are confined. In other cases the combination was felt to do some violence to the language, and becomes more harsh as the meaning of the participle lends itself less easily to being conceived as a quality; hence

<sup>1</sup>Again I cite excluded cases which may be open to doubt, Meno 84 A; cf. Lys. 204 B; Cleit. 409 E; Rep. 581 E; cf. 478 C and Parm. 136 A; Pol. 271 A (Camp. *ad loc.*)

the three groups into which I divided the cases mark stages of increasing difficulty. Only four cases of the third group occur in the Orators, and three of these, as might be expected, in Demosthenes. A parallel adjective preceding mediates the use of the participle, but even examples of this kind are not common and are confined to Isocrates, Aeschines and Demosthenes, the first-named employing only the easiest combinations. In the second form we find cases which do not differ essentially from those of the first form, and, having the same function, have the same limitations. There is further observable a tendency to use this form in the case of verbs which express an abiding condition, particularly *ἔχειν*. In general the more emphatic and pregnant the *εἶναι* becomes, the easier is the combination, since there is an approximation to the ordinary use of a participle of circumstance. Hence in these cases there is greater freedom and a wider range of participles. Thucydides resembles the Orators in his usage. His periphrases of the first form are of the ordinary kind, into which adjectivized participles enter. In those of the second form he is bolder, but only where the stress of meaning is upon the verb. In the pregnant style of Thucydides we should have expected striking cases, but he has adopted another method for expressing characteristic, viz. the use of a periphrasis containing verbal substantives in *-της*. Plato exhibits a very free and accurate use of participial periphrases, as was to be expected in a philosophic writer. They are more frequent in the later and more scientific dialogues, *Sophistes*, *Politicus*, *Parmenides*, *Phileus* and *Timaeus*, but the *Nomoi* and *Epinomis* (comprising about 20 per cent. of the whole of Plato examined) contain 41 per cent. of periphrasis, an increase far beyond the demands of the subject-matter.

#### AORIST PARTICIPLE.

If the theory advanced in this paper be true, periphrases containing aorist participles are not *a priori* to be expected, unless in exceptional cases. Of the three tenses the aorist is fixed most closely to the expression of the actual occurrence of a definite act. It is particular and individual; even the gnomic aorist generalizes through the particular. Accordingly, the aorist participle is not usually placed like the pres. and pf., as an attribute between article and noun. It is true, such phrases as *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀποκτείνας* are characteristic, but the characterization consists in the identification of two individuals *οὗτος* and *ὁ ἀποκτείνας*, hence the article. *οὗτός*

ἐστὶν ἀποκτείνας, on the other hand, does not normally occur, since here ἀποκτείνας would have to be conceived as a generalized characteristic, a conception to which the aorist is in its essence opposed. I have noted a few cases of aorist periphrases which on examination, however, only serve to confirm the conclusions already attained. In the Orators I have noted 4 cases. Two of these occur close together in Ant. 3, 8, 4 and 5: ὁ παιδοτρίβης ἂν ἀποκτείνας αὐτὸν εἶη and τὸ μὲν μεράκιον οὐδενὸς μᾶλλον τῶν συμμελετώντων ἐστὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ ἁμαρτόν. In the former of these passages the insertion of the article with ἀποκτείνας is not difficult, but in the second the change is less easy. It is true τό might easily have fallen out between ἐστὶ and τοῦ, but the writer would scarcely have said τὸ ἁμαρτόν but ὁ ἁμαρτών, and thus we should have to account for a double corruption. There is, moreover, good reason for the omission of the article, and I should be unwilling to make the change in either case. In this tetralogy, the prosecution seeks to show that the defendant is ὁ ἀποκτείνας and ὁ ἁμαρτών. Now the very use of these terms implies the existence of such a person or persons, and from the peculiar circumstances of the case (for which from lack of space I must refer to the speeches themselves), had the defence admitted the existence of such a person, their client must have been that person. In the absence of an indefinite article, then, they are forced to employ the aor. partic. as a characterizing adjective.<sup>1</sup> The other two cases are in Dem. 21 and are introduced by a parallel noun or adjective: 156, καὶ γὰρ μὲν ἐθελοντὴς νῦν, οὗτος δὲ καταστάς ἐξ ἀντιδόσεως τότε where καταστάς is for ὁ καταστάς, the article having been omitted under the influence of the parallel anarthrous noun. 114, οὕτω τοίνυν οὗτός ἐστιν ἀσεβὴς καὶ μιὰρὸς καὶ πᾶν ἂν ὑποστάς εἰπεῖν . . . affords confirmation of the view that the aorist does not lend itself to the expression of characteristic. The nature of the signification of the verb brings about the use of the aor. in preference to the pres., but the writer feeling that ὑποστάς was not fitted to express characteristic, annexed the ἂν and thus gave the requisite generalizing force.

Let us now pass to Plato. The phrase μὴ ἀπαρνηθεὶς γένη, Soph. 217 C, is an evident imitation of tragic style (cf. Soph. Ajax 588; Philoct. 772) and need not detain us here. The remaining 7 cases are all of the second form and parallel to those periphrases of the pres. partic. where the *raison d'être* lies in the so-called auxiliary and the

<sup>1</sup> In 2 γ 8, the ὁ lacking before ἀποκτείνας in the MSS has been inserted, rightly I believe, by the editors.



characterizing force of the participle is absent. The partic. bears the same relation to the εἶναι (γίγνεσθαι) as it would bear to φαίνεσθαι, and, as contrasted with the finite form, the periphrasis marks two stages, that of the action itself, by the participle, and that of the ascertainment, by the verb, *e. g.* Nom. 737 C, ὅγκος δὲ πλῆθους ἱκανὸς οὐκ ἄλλως ὀρθῶς γίγνεται<sup>1</sup> ἂν λεχθείς . . . 'would not turn out to have been rightly calculated.' So 866 D ; 867 C ; 739 E.<sup>2</sup> Again, Pol. 289 A draws more attention than the finite form would have done, to the position of matters subsequent to the act of 'placing.' So Nom. 957 C ; Tim. 47 CD. It will be noted that this form of expression is not common, no examples in the Orators, and 5 of all in the Nomoi. In addition there are 4 cases in Plato where an adjective precedes ; Nom. 711 D is a case with ἂν, parallel to Dem. 21, 114 already explained. Nom. 913 C is similar to 737 C discussed above. Nom. 829 CD is a case of the aorist being used for a pf. under the influence of the negative. Phil. 51 A is exceptional : πρὸς τὸ τινὰς ἡδονὰς εἶναι δοκούσας, οὕσας δὲ οὐδαμῶς, καὶ μεγάλας ἑτέρας τινὰς ἅμα καὶ πολλὰς φαντασθείσας, εἶναι δ' αὐτὰς συμπεφυρμένας ὁμοῦ λύπαις . . . Here the writer does violence to the language to express a special meaning. Φαντασθείσας is characteristic and the present participle would have been expected, but then the natural interpretation would have been, that these pleasures present many appearances at one and the same time, whereas he wishes to say that they underwent continual change and presented many appearances *in succession*. He therefore uses the ingressive aorist, the characterizing force being sufficiently marked by the neighborhood of the participles and adjective.<sup>3</sup>

#### PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

The perfect tense has a two-fold aspect ; in addition to predicating an activity, it predicates an abiding result of that activity. This latter factor may be regarded as an attribute of the thing affected, as a quality which has been generated in the thing. A pf. participle, we conclude then, approaches an adjective closely ; but they differ, inasmuch as the adjective presents a quality merely

<sup>1</sup> The partic. in 739 E might be construed as an ordinary partic. with the subject, but the other is preferable.

<sup>2</sup> I note as before some rejected cases ; in [Lys.] 20, 1, αὐτῶν is predicate, 'for some, having plotted, joined them' ; Phil. 64 B, cf. Phaedr. 245 E ; Pol. 265 D ; Nom. 740 B ; 961 BC ; in Nom. 844 D the partic. is an afterthought ; Pol. 272 D, corrupt ; Theag. 123 A, mark of late origin.



from the point of view of its existence, the pf. participle has regard also to its genesis. Of these two sides presented by the pf. tense, either may predominate ; but it must be noted that, while to express the first of these aspects simply we have another tense, the aorist, there is no tense which can assert the second simply. The consequence of this would be that in general, when the pf. itself is used, the main emphasis would lie on the second side—the existence of the result. But we have already seen that periphrasis is exactly fitted for the presentation of such a conception, and hence the very frequent use of periphrasis in the pf. is in accord with the theory all along maintained in this paper. Again, since the result of an action is more likely to be permanently manifest in the object than in the agent, we are not surprised to find periphrasis more common in the middle-passive than in the active ; and again, the use of finite forms for opt. and subj. of pfs. used as presents is also in accord with what has been laid down. From what has been said, any difference between finite and periphrastic forms in the pf. must in any case be evanescent, and in addition to this we have a disintegrating factor in the defectiveness of the pf. paradigm. When *λέλυνται* and *πεπλεγμένοι εἰσὶ* were used in exactly the same temporal sense, it was inevitable that any difference which might exist between *λέλυνται* and *λελυμένοι εἰσὶ* should be obliterated. Doubtless the emphatic pre-position of *εἶναι* was often a determining factor. I do not propose then to examine in detail the cases of pf. periphrasis, it is sufficient to have shown that the phenomena here also are in accordance with the conclusions elsewhere reached.

W. J. ALEXANDER.

## IV.—STICHOMETRY.

### PART II.

#### *Extension of previous results to Bible-texts.*

It might almost be assumed that the previous investigations as to the nature and interpretation of stichometric data, comprehending as they do writers of so many different centuries, and books of such different character, might be expected to apply without further examination to the texts of the Old and New Testaments. But as the subject reaches here its greatest importance, and has been attended by a good deal of confusion in consequence of the facility with which many of the books of the Bible are divisible into sense-lines, it becomes necessary to establish over again the fixity of the *στίχος*, and other points connected with the development of the art of transcription. This we shall easily be able to do, for the examination of the texts after the manner previously explained will show that in almost every instance the verse of the ancient scribes is a hexameter, and is measured by a standard number of letters or syllables.

#### *Nature of stichometric data for Old and New Testaments.*

The MSS of the Old and New Testaments, but especially of the latter, provide us with a rich collection of stichometric references, both total and partial, which enable us to measure the text with very great accuracy from point to point, and are a very valuable addition to any critical apparatus which is aimed at the restoration of the text of the early centuries. The total subscriptions stand not only at the end of the separate books, but sometimes at the close of a group of books, as the Catholic Epistles; the marginal subscriptions supply us with the successive fiftieth verses, and also with the number of verses proper to any particular lection in a book that has been divided for church or private use.

The stichometric notes do not appear in the archaic numeration which we noted in Herodotus and Demosthenes, nor does the marginal stichometry present itself in the transitional form which

uses the successive letters of the alphabet, but pays no regard to the decimal system, as we have seen it in some Plato and Demosthenes MSS; there is, however, no doubt that these marks are of great antiquity, and in some cases we shall be able to fix an inferior limit to the date of their publication.

*Variations of stichometric attestation.*

There are several hindrances that encounter us at this point of our inquiry; and in particular the variety which is found amongst the stichometric subscriptions of any one book in different MSS seems to militate very strongly against the theory of a fixed and uniform verse-measure. A little consideration, however, shows us that the same argument would hold against the hypothesis of sense-lines, unless we assume that these were perfectly arbitrary in their character, and did not constitute a uniform system of division handed down by tradition as a convenience to the reader and a safeguard to the text.

The real reason of this variety lies in the following direction. First of all we must remember that we are dealing with books whose variety of reading is great, and where the importance attaching to the acceptance or rejection of a reading is likely to make the stichometry agree closely with the compass of the text, and change as the text changes. The insertion or rejection, for instance, of such a passage as the *pericope de adultera* would modify largely the stichometric count in the Gospel of St. John. We must also bear in mind that these books are extant in various versions, and unless we adopt the hypothesis of sense-lines, the count will vary from version to version, even with a similar text.

We have further to observe that in the early Bible-texts we have certain conventional abbreviations which may in some cases even date from the autographs, and which will certainly affect the reckoning if a letter-line be used in the measurements, and probably also where the syllable-line is employed. Then there is a frequent corruption of the actual stichometric data, arising from carelessness on the part of the scribe, and sometimes, perhaps, from an ignorance on his part as to the meaning of certain old symbols employed to designate the numbers 90 and 900, etc. Last of all, it is possible that we may have to admit in some cases a variety in the measuring-line, though we shall still see that the most usual unit is the 16-syllabled hexameter.

*Transition from space-lines to sense-lines.*

We shall also be able to trace that same law of degradation in the form of the transcription which we observed to hold in the adaptation of continuous uncial texts to public reading ; and it is possible that the first step towards this change of style in the early MSS consists in the *exact* numeration of the text from point to point by means of a suitable line-unit.

This change of form is first apparent in the poetical books of the Old Testament, from which it seems to have spread gradually to the whole of the Bible. We have already seen from Jerome's preface to Isaiah, that the method of division by *cola* and *commata* was becoming general, and was reckoned by Jerome himself to be as applicable to the Psalms as to the writings of Demosthenes and Cicero, and to the prophets as to the Psalms and other distinctly poetical books. And it is almost inevitable that if two different systems of transcription, corresponding respectively to stichometry and colometry, are found in the same volume, that a degree of confusion will arise between the regular verses of the earlier and the irregular verses of the later system, and that in the end one of these systems will entirely supplant the other. This explains how it is that we find the term *στίχος* retained even when the fixed line to which it properly belongs has disappeared. It is in consequence of this degradation of form that we find the poetical books of the Old Testament in the earliest uncial MSS written in quite a different manner from the rest of the Bible. For example, the triple and quadruple columns of the Vatican and Sinaitic codices are replaced in these books by double columns of irregular verses, forming a remarkable contrast to the uniform writing of the remaining books. I regard it, however, as certain that this quasi-stichometry is not the original form of the books where it appears. The Song of Solomon, for example, is stated by Nicephorus and Anastasius to contain 280 verses ; and, by an actual enumeration, it may be seen to be 275 sixteen-syllabled hexameters, which is such a close agreement that we may conclude that the earlier mode of reckoning, and therefore, in all probability, of division of the text, must have been at some time applied to the book in question. A great deal of light is thrown upon these points by some remarks of Hesychius of Jerusalem, in the sixth century, introductory to the study of the twelve minor prophets. An examination of the following passage will show the progressive

encroachment of colon-writing upon the uniform text, and the consequent confusion between the *στίχος*, properly so-called, and its substitute.

Στίχηρον τῶν ιβ' προφητῶν.

Ἔστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπούδασμα, στιχηδόν, ὡς τὰ πολλὰ, πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετωμένων σαφήνειαν, τὰς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι. οὕτω τοιγαροῦν ὄφει μὲν τὸν Δαυὶδ καθαρίζοντα, τὸν Παροιμιαστὴν δὲ τὰς παραβολὰς καὶ τὸν Ἐκκλησιαστὴν τὰς προφητείας ἐκθέμενον, οὕτω συγγραφεῖσαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ Ἰὼβ βίβλον, οὕτω μερισθέντα τοῖς στίχοις τὰ τῶν Ἀισμάτων Ἀισματα: πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον οὕτω τινὶ συγγραφεῖσαν εὐρών, οὐ μάτην ἐν ταῖς δωδέκα βίβλοις τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἠκολούθησα· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ μὲν τῶν ἀσαφῶν ἢ τῶν στίχων σαφηνίζει διαίρεσις, διδάσκει δὲ τῶν στιγμῶν τῶν ἀπόρων ποῦ δεῖ τάττειν τὰς πλείονας, ὥστε καὶ τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ τὸν ἄγαν ἐπιστήμονα τρυγῆσαι τι πάντως ἢ μικρὸν ἢ μέγα τοῦ πονήματος χρήσιμον.<sup>1</sup>

It is evident from the foregoing passage that the first means employed to facilitate the reading of the continuous texts is *interpunction*; and that interpunction paves the way for colon-writing; Hesychius himself extends the irregular verse-writing to the minor prophets, and informs us that some one else had edited the Pauline epistles in a similar manner; and finally we notice that the new form of writing has the effect of restoring to the term *στίχος* somewhat of its original indefiniteness, and deflecting it from a space-line in the direction of a sense-line.

*Actual instance of numbered sense-lines.*

An instance of this deflection may be seen in a MS Memphitic Psalter, referred to by Lagarde in his edition under the sign D, which has stichometric data to every psalm. An examination of these will show that the appended numbers are not proportional to the lengths of the psalms, neither in the Hebrew, the LXX, nor the Coptic. The following table for the first ten psalms, based on Lagarde's edition and on the LXX, will make this apparent. The *στίχος* and psalm are measured in letters:

	Στίχοι.	Memph.	Letters to verse.	LXX.	Letters to verse.
Psalm I	15	514	34.3	604	40.3
II	27	755	28.0	806	29.8
III	15	521	34.7	545	36.3
IV	15	619	41.3	651	43.4
V	28	880	31.4	911	32.5

<sup>1</sup> Migne, Patrol. Graec. 93, col. 1340.

	Στίχοι.	Memph.	Letters to verse.	LXX.	Letters to verse.
Psalm VI	21	621	29.6	709	33.7
VII	37	1180	31.9	1289	34.0
VIII	17	619	36.4	646	38
IX	82	2559	31.2	2908	35.4
X	17	528	31.0	583	34.3

It is, however, easy to write the Psalms rhythmically in irregular sentences, so as to make the reckoning true. For instance, the 119th Psalm, which has 176 verses in ordinary Bibles, has 170 in the Memphitic text. It is even possible that the figure 6 has dropped. The remarkable point to notice is that the irregular verses are numbered just like the regular ones, a practice which leads to some confusion, though it has the advantage of giving the same reckoning for all the various versions.

#### *Euthalius and his work.*

We turn now to the stichometry of the New Testament. And here a fundamental misunderstanding seems to have prevailed for a length of time as to the connexion between Euthalius of Alexandria and the stichometric divisions of the text.

Scholz, in his *Prolegomena*, I xxvii, states that "Euthalius in epistolis Paulinis, actibus apostolorum et epistolis catholicis, eos (sc. versus) ita distinxit in usum lectorum, ut singulae lineae singulas absolverent sententias; qua distinctione observata scirent lectores quae continuo spiritu essent legenda, atque ubi intermissione opus esset. Exaratis in hunc modum epistolis adtexuit ad calcem cujusque epistolae numerum versiculorum, qui in plurimos codices irrepsit."

And the same statement somewhat modified seems to have been repeated right on to the present. According to Scrivener, *Introduction to the N. T.* p. 60,<sup>1</sup> "Euthalius is said to have been the *author* of that reckoning of the στίχοι which is annexed in most copies *to the Gospels*, as well as the Acts and Epistles"; and in the introduction to the American edition of Westcott and Hort's New Testament, Dr. Schaff remarks "that the stichometric divisions or lines (στίχοι) *corresponding to sentences were introduced by Euthalius.*"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 60, 2d Ed.; p. 62, 3d Ed.

<sup>2</sup> Misled by the concurrence of these and other New Testament editors and critics, I endeavored to believe that in some way Euthalius and stichometry were inseparable; and for this reason stated in a former article that the division of the New Testament into numbered sense-lines was introduced by Euthalius.

But it will easily be seen that in no strict sense can Euthalius ever be regarded as the inventor of stichometry which is anterior in date to the Christian era, and by no means a peculiarity of the New Testament; that he did not measure the Gospels at all; nor will it be easy to prove that he broke up the text into sentences, nor are these sentences the *στίχοι* which he enumerates. In fact, the New Testament text was reckoned by *στίχοι* long before the time of Euthalius, as we find that Origen reckons the second and third epistles of John to be less than a hundred verses, and the first epistle to contain a very few; and in the fourth century Eustathius of Antioch quotes two passages in the Gospel of John, with a remark that the interval between them is 135 *στίχοι*. Euthalius was a deacon of Alexandria somewhere about A. D. 458, and subsequently became bishop of Sulca, supposed by some persons to

live in upper Egypt. He describes his work in a dedication to the younger Athanasius, in the following language:

τοῦ δὲ οὗτοῦ ἐργατοῦ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον στοιχειδῶς ἀναγνοῦς τε καὶ  
καὶ, πρῶτον διεπερφόρων πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ πατέρων ἡμεῶν, μετρίως  
αὐτῶν ἐμοὶ . . .<sup>1</sup>

καὶ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔφαθον, τὴν Παύλου βίβλον ἀνεγνώσκας, στίχους δὲ τε καὶ  
καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πρᾶξων ὅρα τῇ τῶν καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐβδόμη  
καὶ, ὁρτίως σοι ἐπέσχετο . . .<sup>2</sup>

καὶ ταυτοῖς φιλολογεῖς ὅρα ὑπάρχουσιν τὰς τρίτας, . . . ἐπαγγελίας ἔραστον  
τῶν πρᾶξων βίβλον ὅρα, καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀνεγνώσκας τε καὶ  
καὶ καὶ πᾶσι ἀποκεφαλαιώσασθαι, καὶ διελθεῖς ταύτας ἐκίστης τὸν καὶ  
ἐρὶς προσέταξας, ἀδελφεῖ Ἀθανάσιε προσφιλίστατε, καὶ ταῦτα αἰσῶντος ἐγὼ  
αἶψα πεπονημένος, στοιχειδῶς τε στίχοις ταύτας τὸ ἔφαθον, κατὰ τὴν ἐμμετροῦ  
ρίαν, πρὸς εὐσχημὴ ἀνεγνώσκας, διεπερφόρων ἐν βραχεὶ τὰ ἑσπετά σοι . . .<sup>3</sup>

καὶ τοὶ στοιχειδῶς τὰς καθολικὰς καὶ ἐξῆς ἐπιστολὰς ἀνεγνώσκας, τὴν τῶν  
καὶ ἐκίστην ὅρα καὶ ταῖς μετρίως ἐκίστην μετρίως ἐκίστην μετρίως.

καὶ τὰς ἀνεγνώσκας καὶ ἐκίστην τῶν ἀποστολικῶν βίβλον ἀνεγνώσκας  
καὶ τὰς ἀνεγνώσκας καὶ ἐκίστην τῶν ἀποστολικῶν βίβλον ἀνεγνώσκας  
καὶ τὰς ἀνεγνώσκας καὶ ἐκίστην τῶν ἀποστολικῶν βίβλον ἀνεγνώσκας

the confusion seems to have arisen in the text of the previous  
verses between *στοιχειδῶς* and *στοιχειδῶν*. Of the three passages in  
the words occur, Zacagni edits *στοιχειδῶς* in two places, while  
max with others reads *στοιχειδῶν* uniformly. An examination  
of these passages will, I think, show that it is almost as difficult to

1. *ibid.* p. 404.  
2. *ibid.* 477.

3. *ibid.* 405.  
4. *ibid.* 541.

5. *ibid.* 405.

prove that Euthalius introduced stichometry into the New Testament as to prove that he introduced reading and writing (*ἀναγνούς τε καὶ γράψας*). The peculiar features of the arrangement of his text are prefaces, programmata, lists of quotations with reference to the authors, sacred and profane, from whom they come, and a complete system of convenient lections and chapters. The edition was also provided with a stichometric indication on the margin of every fiftieth verse and at the close of every complete lection. These annotations made reading and quotation a much easier business, but they are clearly only ancillary to the general arrangement of the work, though by a strange want of perspective the last feature has been made the most prominent one in the literary estimate of Euthalius. Neither must it be assumed that the lections which Euthalius marked are of his own division; in the Pauline epistles they have evidently been adopted from some earlier father, who gives his own date (A. D. 396?)<sup>1</sup> in a prologue to the work, which Euthalius merely corrects in an appended sentence. The chapters also, at least in the Acts, are divided according to two totally distinct systems; this fact alone shows that Euthalius is retailing the Masoretic efforts of earlier students.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Importance of the Euthalian stichometry.*

The importance of the stichometric work done by Euthalius does not, however, diminish when we discount its originality; on the contrary it increases. For in the first place he distinctly informs us that his measurements were *accurate*; and in the next place, the MSS which he employed, at least for the Acts and Catholic Epistles,<sup>3</sup> were the celebrated copies preserved at Caesarea in the library of Pamphilus.<sup>4</sup> It is unfortunate that the word *ἀκριβής* which Euthalius employs, and which makes the weight of his work, has been so much overlooked. Accurate measurements made by reference to the best MSS provide us with critical data of immense value. It becomes interesting, then, to find out what the accurate measuring line is which Euthalius employs.

In Zacagni's edition of Euthalius, or in the less complete one of Migne,<sup>5</sup> we have a rich vein of stichometric information which

<sup>1</sup> Zacagni, p. 536.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Tregelles, Canon Muratorianus, p. 104; Hug. Introduction to New Test. (English Trans.), i. p. 253.

<sup>3</sup> Zacagni, p. 513.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, 85, col. 691.

<sup>5</sup> Patr. Graec. 85.



seems to have been very slightly worked. Not only is every programme, preface, and elenchus measured and the number of *στίχοι* appended, but there are so many intermediate stichometric data supplied for the text that we can measure from point to point with great accuracy, as soon as we know the measuring line employed.

M. Graux examined casually the numeration of the separate lections for the Acts of the Apostles, but he was perplexed at finding that the data supplied by Zacagni from the Vatican Codex Regius-Alexandrinus did not tally with those given by a Madrid MS Codex Escorial.  $\psi$ —111—6, and he seems to have given up the point in despair. The following table affords a comparison between the measures of the lections as given by the two MSS, and those given by actual division of Westcott and Hort's text into 16-syllabled *στίχοι*:

<i>Lection.</i>	<i>Chapter and Verse.</i>	<i>Cod. Esc.</i>	<i>R. Al.</i>	<i>Syllabic.</i>
1	I 1	40	...	40
2	I 15	30	30	30
3	II 1	109	109	111
4	III 1	136	136	143
5	IV 32	100	100	121
6	VI 1	88	220	190
7	VII 1 ( <i>ἐγένετο</i> )	92	120	94
8	VIII 1	75	95	77
9	IX 32	216	250	210
10	XI 27	283	300	272
11	XV 1	193	200	201
12	XVII 1	164	180	164
13	XIX 1	239	240	242
14	XXI 15	293	293	307
15	XXIV 27	168	268	160
16	XXVII 1	198	?	192

The remarkable agreement between the first and third columns<sup>1</sup> leaves little room for doubt that Euthalius employed as his measure a rhythm of sixteen syllables. The data of the Madrid MS are better preserved than the other's: in the sixth lection the figure ρ has evidently dropped, and there are several other minor corruptions.

<sup>1</sup> Some trifling alterations have been made in correcting these figures from their first publication in Johns Hopkins University Circulars No. 35. The same remark applies to the tables which follow.

*Comparison between traditional and measured verses.*

A similar closeness of agreement is found between the other data supplied by Zacagni for the intermediate stichometry, and those furnished by actual measurement of the text; and the total is also found to be in remarkable agreement with the subscription of the best MSS and of Euthalius. The results are so good, in fact, that we are tempted to repeat Euthalius' work, and we shall divide the whole of the Acts and Epistles as given in Westcott and Hort into sixteen-syllabled hexameters. This being done, we exhibit the results, as in the subjoined table, and compare them with those deduced from Euthalius and from the majority of the codices of the New Testament in which any verse-measures have been preserved.

	Στίχοι by tradition.	Στίχοι by measurement.
Acts	2556	2559
James	237 or 242	240
I Peter	232, 236 or 242 <sup>1</sup>	245
II Peter	154	162
I John	274	268
II John	30	31
III John	32	31
Jude	68	70
Total for Catholic Ep.	1047	1047
Romans	920	942
I Corinthians	870	897
II Corinthians	590	610
Galatians	293	304
Ephesians	312	325
Philippians	208	218
Colossians	208	215
I Thessalonians	193	202
II Thessalonians	106	112
Hebrews	703	714
I Timothy	230	239
II Timothy	172	177
Titus	97	98
Philemon	38	42

<sup>1</sup> Some confusion is apparent between the subscriptions in James and I Peter, which makes it necessary to record the principal variants; in other places these are not given, but may be found in Scholz and the ordinary critical apparatuses.

*Correction of previous results for abbreviation.*

The approximation of the results is very striking; but there is almost always an excess in the second column, amounting in some cases to as much as 5 or 6 per cent.; and this uniformity of effect implies some producing cause. Now it can scarcely be maintained that the text of Westcott and Hort is ever much in excess of the text of Pamphilus, and so we have only one hypothesis to fall back upon: the text measured must have had abbreviations in it. Let us then assume that the four words *θεός*, *κύριος*, *ἰησοῦς*, *χριστός*, are abbreviated: we ought then on the average to deduct a syllable every time the words *θεός*, *χριστός* occur, and two syllables for the other two words. The correction is easily made by means of a concordance with sufficient accuracy, and the result can be expressed at once in hexameters and so deducted: when this is done for the Epistles we have as follows:

	<i>Traditional verses.</i>	<i>Measured verses.</i>
James	237 or 242	237
I Peter	232, 236 or 242	240
II Peter	154	158
I John	274	262
II John	30	30
III John	32	31
Jude	68	68
Romans	920	919
I Corinthians	870	874
II Corinthians	590	596
Galatians	293	296
Ephesians	312	314
Philippians	208	209
Colossians	208	209
I Thessalonians	193	194
II Thessalonians	106	106
Hebrews	703	705
I Timothy	230	234
II Timothy	172	170
Titus	97	97
Philemon	38	40

Allowing for the diversity of texts and for possible errors in the numbers copied, it would be unreasonable to expect a closer agree-

ment between results. We have now the direct comparison between the text of Westcott and Hort and the early codices, as well as a satisfactory conclusion with regard to the verse-unit employed by Euthalius. The importance of this discovery consists in the fact that the question of stichometry is now removed from the region of averages, and we are able to determine the length of any passage to within a hexameter. The only difficulty of a practical character is the divination of the particular forms of abbreviation employed in the copies to which Euthalius referred, and in the partial stichometry there is the difficulty of determining to what part of a line the numerical indication applies. It must also be borne in mind that in the statements made by Euthalius as to his own accuracy (*ἀκριβῶς*) the remark is in strictness limited to the Pauline epistles.

A glance at the results already arrived at will show that the greatest inequality between the results is found in the first epistle of John, where the traditional measure is 274 verses against 268 or 262 according as we admit abbreviation or not. At first sight this would seem to imply that the Euthalian texts contained a considerable passage which is not found in Westcott and Hort, and the celebrated passage I John v. 7 at once suggests itself. When, however, we examine the partial stichometric data which Zacagni collected from his Vatican MSS, we find that the same inequality runs through the book. For instance, Zacagni directs us to put the mark for the first hundred verses against c. ii. 26, at which point the actual count has only reached 90. There is, therefore, some unexplained peculiarity to be dealt with before we can come to any critical conclusion as to the verse in question.

*Further verification of the length of the Euthalian verse.*

We may readily confirm the previous results by examining the prefaces, prologues, etc., of Euthalius which are prefixed to the separate books, a large proportion of which are numbered in *στίχοι*. And although in some instances corruption has taken place in the figures, the majority of the data agree closely with the hexameter hypothesis. For example, the following table will give the comparison between the data supplied for the Acts and Catholic Epistles and the numbers obtained by syllabic division.

*Acts of the Apostles.*

		<i>Traditional.</i>	<i>Calculated.</i>
Πρόλογος τῶν Πράξεων	(Migne, col. 628)	140 <sup>1</sup>	138
Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις	( " 640)	? <sup>2</sup>	107
Ἐκθεσις κεφαλαίων	( " 652)	? 17	11
Κεφάλαια τῶν Πράξεων	( " 652)	172	178
Breviarium capitulorum	( " 661)	40	40

*Catholic Epistles.*

Ἀνακεφαλαίωσις	(Migne, col. 668)	14 <sup>3</sup>	14
Κεφάλαια Ἰακώβου	( " 677)	25	26
Κεφάλαια Πέτρου α'	( " 680)	25	24
Κεφάλαια Πέτρου β'	( " 684)	10	10
Κεφάλαια Ἰωάννου α'	( " 685)	23	23
Κεφάλαια Ἰωάννου β'	( " 688)	5	5
Κεφάλαια Ἰούδα	( " 689)	11	11

And in the same way we might count the text of Euthalius through the Pauline Epistles, and we should find our hypothesis fully confirmed. There is sometimes, as above, a little confusion in the figures, but this is precisely what we expect when figures are handed down by successive transcription.

These then are some of the results of comparison between a measured selected text and the traditional verse-numberings. Although they are more irregular in the Gospels, to which we shall presently refer, than in the Epistles, it must be admitted that in both cases (but especially in the Epistles) they offer a new critical instrument to the student of the New Testament, by means of which to restore the text to the same compass as it occupied in early copies.

The matter is, however, much complicated by those causes which produce diverse measurement, to which allusion has been already made. Corruption of the data is common, and frequently affects the greater part of the testimony: for example, the number of verses in Romans is 920, as given by Euthalius and many MSS; but a larger group gives the impossible λκ and λη, which are nothing more than a corruption of Ϟκ. It is, perhaps, a reasonable prediction that the next edition of the New Testament will be accompanied by a marginal stichometry.

<sup>1</sup> PN in Reg. Alex. PM in Cod. Esc.

<sup>2</sup> PN in Reg. Al. PK in Cod. Esc. PZ or PH corr.

<sup>3</sup> The reading λΙ of R. Al. and ΙΑ of Cryptoferr. are evidently corruptions of this.

*Instances of partial stichometry.*

Zacagni, in his edition of Euthalius, has furnished us with a series of notes and various readings under the title “*Variae lectiones ex Regio Alexandrino Vaticanae Bibliothecae codice depromptae.*” Amongst these are found a great many instances of partial stichometry: some of these coincide with the close of the lections; and others have reference to the measurement by fifties and hundreds, of which Euthalius speaks as having been a feature of his edition, though it is by no means certain that he introduced it. The following instances are given for the margin of the Acts:

<i>Chapter.</i>	<i>No. of verses.</i>	<i>No. of verses by count as before: 16-syll. abbr.</i>	<i>Chapter.</i>	<i>No. of verses.</i>	<i>No. of verses by count as before: 16-syll. abbr.</i>
1, 15	40	40	15, 34	1350	1352
1, 19	50	50	17, 1	1465	1460
2, 36	150	150	17, 15	1500	1502
3, 11	200	201	18, 4 (?)	1550	1570
4, 23	300	297	18, 11	1590 (?)	1580
4, 31	315	319	19, 11	1650	1655
6, 1	440	438	20, 7	1750	1751
6, 5	450	449	20, 28	1800	1803
7, 10	500	501	21, 8	1850	1852
7, 53	600	610	21, 14	1870	1870
7, 60	625	625	21, 28	1900	1905
8, 13	650	654	22, 5	1950	1953
8, 34	700	703	22, 26	2000	2004
9, 1	717	719	23, 10	2050	2046
9, 15	750	751	23, 30	2100	2102
9, 31	792	795	24, 18	2150	2153
9, 36	800	804	25, 4	2170 (?)	2187
10, 12	850	851	25, 12	2200	2210
11, 7	950	954	26, 1	2250	2255
11, 27	998	1000	27, 1	2325	2336
13, 11	1100	1102	27, 10	2350	2360
14, 1	1200	1201	27, 29	2400	2406
15, 1	1271	1271	28, 1	2450	2452
15, 11	1300	1301	28, 17	2500 (?)	2485

And the completed reckoning gives us 2559, which must be corrected for abbreviations to 2527; results which agree very closely with the number given by Euthalius, 2556; and the number given

by Scholz from a large group of manuscripts, 2524. It will be noticed that our reckonings are 2 or 3 verses only in excess in either case.

In the partial stichometry tabulated above, it will be noticed that the results (which I have done my best to keep clear of error) are very closely in harmony with one another: and it is conceivable that the adoption of a letter-line might make the approximation even more close. In one or two of the data errors appear, as at c. XVIII 4, where we have 1550 verses; and at XXV 4 we are told to put the figure 2170, where the scribe seems to have dropped a ten, and the defect shows itself in the subsequent figures. It must be remembered that a single printed verse will sometimes contain five or six *στίχοι*, so that we could hardly look for much better agreement, and we must defer a closer critical comparison until the text can be printed stichometrically with proper abbreviations, and an accurate marginal reckoning of the lines, suitable for comparison with a revised critical edition of Euthalius. I think we may conclude also that the printed text of Westcott and Hort in the Acts is within three hexameters of the text circulated in the third century.

The importance of these intermediate stichometric data is obvious; and the only difficulty in applying them lies in the determination of the part of the verse to which the stichometric number belongs. Sometimes an intimation of this is given by Zacagni, at other times he does no more than designate the verse against the margin of which the mark stands.

Let us apply the evidence supplied by these marks to the critical question of the authenticity of the passage Acts VIII 38. The doubtful sentence is about three hexameters long. Against the margin of VIII 34 stands the number 700: against the first verse of IX, which is also a new lection, the number 717.

The 34th verse of the eighth chapter is 2½ hexameters, from the 35th to the end is 13 hexameters, omitting the doubtful words, and the first verse of the 9th chapter is a hexameter and a half.

But since this first verse ought clearly not to be counted, for the beginning of the lection is the point noted, we have at the most 15½ hexameters, with no allowance made for abbreviation. It requires, therefore, the disputed passage to make up the tale. The partial stichometry, therefore, recognizes this passage.

We shall now give in order for the Catholic Epistles, for convenience of reference, the Euthalian measures, together with any partial stichometry supplied by Zacagni:

		<i>Verses.</i>
James	Lecture I	112
	II (c. 3, 1)	121
I Peter	Lecture I	58?
	II (c. 2, 9)	149?
II Peter	Lecture I	154
I John	Lecture I	150
	II (c. 3, 15)	140
II John	Lecture I	30
III John	Lecture I	31
Jude	Lecture I	68
James	c. 1, 26	50
	c. 2, 21	100
	<i>ad fin.</i>	230 (? 237)
I Peter	c. 1, 22	50
	c. 2, 9	58
	c. 4, 19	200
	<i>ad fin.</i>	246
II Peter	c. 2, 1	50
	c. 2, 20	100
	c. 3, 17	150
	<i>ad fin.</i>	154
I John	c. 2, 26	100
	c. 4, 11	200
II John	<i>ad fin.</i>	37 (?)
III John	<i>ad fin.</i>	32
Jude	v. 14	50
	<i>ad fin.</i>	68

In the Pauline Epistles we have the following data :

Romans	Lecture I	242
	II c. 5, 1	248
	III c. 9, 1	185
	IV c. 12, 1	125
	V c. 15, 1	125
	Total	920
I Corinthians	Lecture I	250
	II c. 7, 1	84
	III c. 8, 1	116
	IV c. 12, 1	266
	V c. 15, 1	154
	Total	870



		<i>Verses.</i>
II Corinthians	Lecture I	152
	II c. 4, 7	156
	III c. 8, 1	94
	IV c. 10, 1	187
	Total	590
Galatians	Lecture I	130
	II c. 3, 15	163
	Total	293
Ephesians	Lecture I	136
	II c. 4, 1	176
	Total	312
Philippians	Lecture I	120
	II c. 3, 1	88
	Total	208
Colossians	Lecture I	157
	II c. 3, 17	51
	Total	208
I Thessalonians	Lecture I	193
II Thessalonians	Lecture I	106
Hebrews	Lecture I	257
	II c. 7, 11	232
	III c. 11, 1	214
	Total	703
I Timothy	Lecture I	230
II Timothy	Lecture I	179 (? 172)
Titus	Lecture I	97
Philemon	Lecture I	37
Total for the Pauline epistles,		4936

The partial stichometry is as follows :

Romans c. 1, 24	50	Romans c. 9, 30	550
2, 14	100	11, 1	600
3, 9	150	11, 24	650
4, 9	200	12, 1	675
5, 1	240	12, 11	700
5, 6	250	13, 13	750
6, 1	300	14, 23	800
7, 1	350	15, 25	850
7, 21	400	16, 18	900
8, 22	450		

I Cor.	c. 1, 26	50	I Cor.	c. 12, 1	550
	3, 4	100		12, 27	600
	4, 8	150		14, 29	700
	5, 10	200		15, 1	720
	7, 27	300		15, 16	750
	8, 1	331		15, 47	800
	9, 16	400		16, 13	850
	11, 10	500			
II Cor.	c. 3, 2	100	II Cor.	c. 9, 14	400
	5, 10	200		11, 4	450
	8, 1	308		11, 26	500
	8, 20	350		12, 18	550
Gal.	c. 2, 1	50	Gal.	c. 3, 24	150
	2, 21	100		4, 27	200
	3, 15	130		5, 22	250
Ephes.	c. 3, 3	100	Ephes.	c. 5, 28	250
	3, 21	136		6, 19	300
	4, 10	150			
Phil.	c. 1, 17	50	Phil.	c. 3, 1	120
	2, 19	100		4, 18	200
Colos.	c. 1, 23	50	Colos.	c. 3, 18	157
	2, 14	100		4, 16	200
	3, 13	150			
I Thess.	c. 2, 10	50	I Thess.	c. 5, 3	150
	3, 11	100			
II Thess.	c. 2, 9	50			
Hebrews	c. 2, 8	50	Hebrews	c. 9, 21	400
	3, 12	100		11, 5	500
	4, 14	150		11, 26	550
	5, 13	200		12, 4	600
	7, 2	250		13, 1	650
	7, 25	300		13, 23	700
	9, 1	350			
I Tim.	c. 4, 1	100	I Tim.	c. 6, 10	200
	5, 11	150			
II Tim.	c. 2, 14	50	II Tim.	c. 4, 16	150
	3, 6	100			

*Extension of enquiry to the Gospels.*

When we turn to the Gospels we find a difficulty arises from the fact that almost all the causes which tend to produce variety of stichometric subscription are in operation. In particular the variety of texts is great. The Textus Receptus, for example, shows an excess of at least 50 hexameters in the Gospel of Matthew over the text of Westcott and Hort. This makes our enquiry extremely interesting, for we begin at once to ask such questions as relate to the authenticity of the last twelve verses of Mark, the *pericope de adultera*, and other important passages. Does the stichometry, which is certainly very ancient, recognize these disputed places as belonging to the texts of the New Testament on which its reckoning is based? In the first place we have to face the diversity of the traditional measurements; the following tables are based upon numbers supplied by Scholz, Tischendorf and Scrivener.

*Matthew.*

<i>MS.</i>		<i>Στίχοι.</i>
428	αυοδ'	= 1474
421	βν'	= 2400
157	βυπδ'	= 2484
161	βφ'	= 2500
164, 262, 300, 376	βφιδ' = (? βφνδ')	= 2554
9, 13, 124, 163, 174, 175, 345, 346, 427	βφξ'	= 2560
G. H. S. 7, 18, 28, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, 117, 122, 131, 153, 237, 241, 246, 252, 261, 263, 277, 280, 290, 292, 347, 348, 388, 435, and l, m, n, w, (of Scr.)	βχ'	= 2600
K. 6, 116, 387	βψ'	= 2700
339	βωξ	= 2860
264, 273	γτςζ'	=? 3397

*Mark.*

4	ακ'	= 1020
164, 262, 300, 376	αφς'	= 1506
117, 153, 157	αφν'	= 1550
Λ.	αφλγ'	= 1590
G. H. S. 7, 18, 28, 41, 45, 48, 50, 128, 167, 202, 237, 241, 246, 252, 261, 267, 277, 280, 290, 292, 301, 347, 388	αχ'	= 1600
9, 13, 124, 163, 174, 175, 339, 346, 427, 435,	αχισ'	= 1616
K. 6, 116, 387, 128, 131	αψ'	= 1700
264, 273	αωκθ'	= 1829

*Luke.*

20	$\beta\chi\zeta'$	= 2606
$\Lambda$ . 164, 262, 300, 376	$\beta\chi\omicron\zeta'$	= 2676
124, 163, 174, 175, 345, 346	$\beta\psi\mu'$	= 2740
9, 13, 427	$\beta\psi\nu'$	= 2750
157	$\beta\psi\xi'$	= 2760
G. H. K. S. 4, 6, 18, 28, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, 116, 117, 122, 128, 131, 153, 202, 237, 241, 246, 252, 261, 263, 267, 277, 280, 290, 292, 347, 348, 387, 388, 435, and l, m, n, 264, 273	$\beta\omega'$	= 2800
	$\gamma\omega\kappa\zeta'$	= 3827

*John.*

4	$\alpha\tau'$	= 1300
157	$\alpha\varpi\lambda'$	= 1930
20	$\beta\iota'$	= 2010
9, 13, 124, 163, 174, 175, 345, 367, 427	$\beta\kappa\delta'$	= 2024
$\Lambda$ . 164, 262, 300, 376	$\beta\sigma\iota'$	= 2210
G. H. S. 4, 6, 7, 18, 28, 41, 45, 46, 48, 50, 122, 128, 131, 167, 202, 241, 252, 261, 263, 267, 277, 280, 290, 292, 301, 347, 348, 387, 388, and l, m, n,	$\beta\tau'$	= 2300

These are the principal MSS data, and it must be owned that their discordance is a formidable objection to the assumption that the Gospels are measured in precisely the same way as the Epistles. A number of the data are evidently corruptions; in Matthew  $\beta\omega\xi'$  is probably altered from  $\beta\phi\xi'$ ; in Luke  $\beta\chi\zeta'$  is obtained by omission of a single letter from  $\beta\chi\omicron\zeta'$ , and so on.

In the Synoptic Gospels, the main body of the MSS divides into two groups, of which one gives the  $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\iota$  to the nearest hundred, and the other goes more into detail. When we find Matthew to consist of 2560 or 2600, Mark of 1616 or 1600, Luke of 2740 or 2800, we may regard the larger group of MSS as less accurate than the other. The problem is now much simplified.

In the Gospel of John the numbers are difficult to arrange; it is almost impossible to believe that the book contains 2300 verses, and we may perhaps set the result again with the group of MSS that gives 2024. This is the number given by Scrivener. For the present, then, let us adopt the numbers 2560, 1616, 2750, 2024 for the four Gospels. We must now divide the text of Westcott and Hort and the Textus Receptus into 16-syllabled rhythms as before, firstly, without abbreviations of text, and secondly, with the same abbreviations as were previously noted. We have then:

course be higher than the worth of the tradition.

will arise in the working out of the manner of syllabic division in early MSS. The question arises as to whether, in MSS, syllabic, etc.

of the New Testament have now been of the Apocalypse. For this there is evidence in the MSS, but the stichometric verses 1400. By actual enumeration we find abbreviated, which does not agree with the

### *Testament Stichometry.*

In the Septuagint and Apocryphal books, the stichometric table of Nicephorus, previously mentioned, is exhibited in a Latin translation of which almost every instance the number of verses is in round hundreds. A stichometric table is also given by Hieronymus. Other data referred to by M. Graux, 1888 *Catena in Heptateuchum*, Codex Escorialensis. M. Graux employs these numerical data to determine the value of the *στίχος* and the average hexameter. The table of Nicephorus has been reprinted in Credner, *Zur Septuaginta*, in Migne's *Patrologia* 100, col. 1055 sqq., and in the *Canon*, p. 560-2. It is therefore unnecessary to say that it is well to notice that Westcott hardly mentions stichometry when he says (p. 520) that the tables are no more than tables of contents. If the table had been a little less approximate in its numbers and of preservation it would have been valuable and deserves a careful examination in the light of the facts. As it stands, it sufficiently verifies (which the contents would do) the hypothesis of the hexameter. It is incidentally interesting as throwing light on some lost apocryphal books. For instance, the book of Modad, which is quoted in Heras' Vision, is about 300 verses, or almost as long as the Epistle to the Hebrews. So also the Apocryphal Ascension of Moses, to which Origen refers the quotation in Jude 9, is a

<sup>1</sup> Orig. de Princip. iii 2.

work twice as long as the Epistle to the Hebrews. To the same source Euthalius<sup>1</sup> refers Gal. 6, 15, οὔτε περιτομή τι ἐστὶν οὔτε ἀκροβυστία ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις, which throws light upon the reading of Codex B and allied documents which omit ἐν  $\chi\omega\iota\upsilon$ . I suppose we may assume the genuineness of these quotations, for either Euthalius verified them himself, or being, as he says, merely a novice, and having no originality beyond what we may call a printer's or editor's originality, he referred to some earlier writer; a supposition which by no means detracts from the value of the quotations. And who shall say that the greater part of Euthalius' work does not date from the time and school of Origen himself?

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

<sup>1</sup> Zacagni, p. 561.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

An Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse. By HENRY SWEET, M. A. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1881.

An Anglo-Saxon Primer. By HENRY SWEET, M. A. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1882.

Specimens of Early English. By the Rev. RICHARD MORRIS, LL.D. Part I. A. D. 1150-1300. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1882.

Mr. Sweet's well-known Anglo-Saxon Reader reached a third edition two years ago, but without "the complete revision promised in the preface to the second edition," and to make such revision he still awaited the publication of Sievers's *Germanic Grammar* and his own *Oldest English Texts*. Sievers's *Anglo-Saxon Grammar* was published in 1882, and Sweet's *Oldest English Texts* is referred to as authority for the gender of certain words in a recent number of the *Anglia*, so that we shall probably soon have a new edition of the Reader, which has already superseded most other Anglo-Saxon text-books. Meantime, however, to meet the want of a more elementary "introduction to the study of Old-English," Mr. Sweet has prepared his Anglo-Saxon Primer, and says, "My main principle has been to make the book the easiest possible introduction to the study of Old-English." It deserves notice in passing that, while Mr. Sweet says in his Reader (p. xi): "In this book the name 'Old English' will be used throughout," and repeats this in his Primer (p. 1), his more practical publishers persist in using the name 'Anglo-Saxon' as a title for each, so that Mr. Sweet will have to "reform it altogether" before the public will understand that 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'Old-English' mean the same thing. Mr. Sweet's Primer contains no poetry, and its 116 pages are made up as follows: Grammar, 54 pages, Texts, 36, Notes, 6, and Glossary, 20. The Grammar contains a useful synopsis of Anglo-Saxon inflection, but in the effort to be concise the phonology lacks clearness and has some omissions, as under *mutations*, *a* to *æ*, *o* to *e*, *e* to *ie*, *ea* to *ie*, and *eo* to *ie*, and the *i*-mutation is the only one treated. Mr. Sweet still prefers to use the terms *mutation* and *gradation* rather than *umlaut* and *ablaut*, but the German terms are decidedly preferable, and have now been used long enough in English to be regarded as thoroughly anglicized. He also discards the term *breaking*, thus losing a convenient term for a most important phonetic change, and classes *breakings* with other changes, as on page 5 *ad fin.*

In the Primer the symbol *ø* is discarded, and while in Reader the pronunciation of short *o* is given as in S. G. *stock* on p. xiv, and in Primer as in F. *beau*, p. 2 *ad init.*, the key-word *not* is given for this sound in Reader, p. xvii, and Primer, p. 2 *ad fin.* The English word *wholly*, as given by Prof. March, expresses the sound more exactly. In both works Mr. Sweet has changed his former views with respect to some sounds, now saying, "*g* had the sound of

E. *y* before *i*, *e*, *ē*, both short and long" (R., p. xiv, cf. P., p. 3), and "*s* had the sound of *z*" (R., p. xv, P., p. 4). In Primer the character *ð* is discarded, and *p* always written, but pronounced with "the sound of our *th* (= *dh*) in *then*," except after "hard" (*i. e.* voiceless) consonants. Nothing seems gained by this forced consistency to suit beginners. Under *gradation* (p. 6) *a . . . ā*, as in *nam*, *ndmon*, is omitted, and a little fuller explanation here would have aided beginners. Mr. Sweet still adheres to the classification of nouns by plurals, though the classification by stems has many advantages, not the least of which is its aid to the student in comprehending the uniform scheme of Teutonic grammar. Under *as*-plurals in Primer the *j*- and *w*-nouns of Reader (*i. e.*, the *ja*- and *wa*-, or according to Sievers the *jo*- and *wo*-stems) are omitted, and nothing is gained by changing the usual order of the cases in inflection, and, under adjectives, of the genders too. Some useful, though brief, remarks on the declension of proper names are added in Primer, but the explanation of the use of the weak declension in adjectives is omitted, which is the more noticeable as the inflection of the article with the adjective is also omitted in Primer: here too the genitive plural is given as *gōdena*, and nothing said, as in Reader, of the occurrence of the more usual *gōdra*. Under the Demonstrative Mr. Sweet now states that "*se* as a demonstrative and personal pronoun has the vowel long," but this statement does not occur in Reader. He also writes in Primer *pds mīn word* (pp. 21, 44, 45, 62) for *pds mīne word* of the Reader (pp. xc, xcii, 51), and says (pp. 43-4) the possessive pronouns always keep the strong form, but according to the Reader (p. 1), *mīne* is strong as well as *mīn*. In Verbs (p. 22), "vowel-mutation" is written for "-gradation," and p. 23, "1st and 2d persons" for "2d and 3d," and under the mutations (p. 23), *a* to *ae*, *e* to *ie*, and *u* to *y*, are omitted. On p. 25 we find *weaxan* now classed with the *fall*-conjugation (though placed in Reader under the *shake*-conjugation), *i. e.*, the reduplicating verbs, but no hint is given in either Reader or Primer that this is the *reduplicating* class. However easy for the memory it may be to class Anglo-Saxon verbs by using an English verb for a title, something more is needed to designate their systematic arrangement; the arrangement by classes showing reduplication and ablaut, as in all the German grammars, is far preferable, and here again it aids the student in learning his Teutonic grammar. In the *fall*-conjugation examples are wanting of stems showing *a* before two consonants, as *spannan*, and those showing *de*, as *ldetan*, the latter being an important omission, as this verb occurs in the texts. The order and name-verbs of some of the conjugations are different in Primer and Reader, an apparently unnecessary change, and the verb *scacan*, which gives the name to one conjugation, is omitted. Under weak verbs in Primer the *wean*-conjugation is classed as entirely separate from the *love*-conjugation, thus differing from the Reader, but for the better. The classification by stems would be preferable here too. In I (b), p. 32, *tellan* is omitted, though occurring in the texts. Under preteritive-presents, called by Mr. Sweet "strong-weak verbs," *unman* and *dugan* are omitted in Primer; they might have been added for the sake of completeness. A few pages on derivation and a serviceable compendium of syntactical usages complete the grammar of the Primer.

The texts consist of sentences "gathered mainly from the Gospels, Aelfric's Homilies, and the Chronicle," selections from St. Matthew and the Old Testa-



## II. LOLOGY.

the Chronicle, and " King are well suited for elementarized, it would be that they tracts from the Chronicle; from King Alfred's translation for many students want an a basis for the historical selections for reading Mr. not interfering with the use intended course. In teaching is not every school or college, however, done a service could wish that he had and conjugations. There vers's Grammar. The fol- p. 58, l. 91, *anslene* (*onslene* on; l. 139, *secgap*; p. 61, l. *es ancennedan*); p. 83, l. 39, ve capital *p*; p. 87, l. 178. 25 should be p. 79; a note 81, *to þam gecicrdon*, after question whether *Hehaman* " instrumental dative of

it may answer its purpose. *elan, sweator, sweotol, tīma, dre.*

introduction to the study of t might be made still more Mr. Sweet " that this little rs, but also to some of our e, most of whom are now tary knowledge of 'Anglo-

art I, has at last appeared, vering the fourteenth cen- riod; and these two books, ie hand, and Prof. Skeat's apply us with a complete Spenser. If they serve no king people the continuity , and colleges will be no lly. Dr. Morris and Prof. of Part I, as in that of Part igations. Heretofore Prof. glish, which includes from cessible for this period to an, Prof. Zupitza's *Übungs-*

buch is too meagre, Prof. Wülcker's *Lesebuch* does not begin early enough, and Maetzner's *Altenglische Sprachproben*, still the fullest and most useful for advanced students, is not so suitable for more elementary instruction, as it is without grammar or glossary, Maetzner's separate glossary being so extensive and so slow in its publication that it will be completed about the end of the century. The present volume consists of nearly 100 pages of Early English grammar based on the Southern dialect (in part contained also in Part II), and following as closely as possible Mr. Sweet's arrangement and classification of declensions and conjugations in his *Anglo-Saxon Reader*. Prof. Skeat has prefixed sections on pronunciation and metre, the former after Ellis, with a scheme of the vowels, chiefly after Stratmann in the *Philological Society's Transactions* for 1867, but "with some re-arrangement and slight modifications." It is this "re-arrangement" that is objectionable from the historical point of view. A student will hardly take up this volume without an elementary knowledge of Anglo-Saxon, and Prof. Skeat acknowledges this in his preface, p. xvi. Therefore the vowels should have been arranged on the basis of the Anglo-Saxon vowels, showing under what different forms each *Anglo-Saxon* vowel appears in Early English. This arrangement is not only much simpler, but more logical, and is strictly historical. The list as given has some omissions, e. g., short *a* = A. S. *ea*; *ae* = A. S. *a*, *e*, *ɛ*, and *ea*; and long *æ* = A. S. *æ*, so common in Layamon; also *aem* will hardly answer for an example of *ae* = A. S. *ae*. The phonology should be revised and rearranged. Prof. Skeat's section on metre, though brief, is useful, as text-books universally, one may say, neglect this important subject; his remarks on the metre of Layamon may be usefully compared with what Schipper says (III 7) on the same subject. In the forms of the pronouns there are several omissions, but perhaps it was not intended to give *all* the various forms which occur in the dialects. The strong verbs are classed as in Sweet, although the order differs from that in both *Reader* and *Primer*; in a connected series of text-books we should expect it to be the same in each. There are, however, some wrong classifications: *gnawen* (p. lxvi) belongs to the *shake*-, not to the *fall*-conjugation; *drepen* and *steken* to the *give*-, not to the *bear*-conjugation; and some omissions of verbs are found in the texts and glossary: *laken*, under *fall*; *wreken*, under *give*; *ripen* (?), of which a past plural *repen* is found in I 196, and *witen*, under *drive*, and *bruken* under *choose*; also *drapen*, II 28, past plural of *drepen*, is omitted in the list of verbs; and *waxen* is put under *shake*, as in Sweet's *Reader*. Under anomalous verbs *daren* is given as infinitive where we should expect *durren*, and *unned* as past participle of *unnen*. A few misprints in grammar are *cuman* (p. lxix), *slep* (p. lxxx), and *nade* (p. lxxxii).

The selections for reading consist of nineteen pieces extending from Old English Homilies, before 1150, to King Horn, before 1300, comprising 286 pages, so that a very complete collection of specimens of English for this difficult and little-known period in the history of the language is given. The publications of the Early English Text Society have rendered such a series possible. These selections are in different dialects, and there are not many pieces that are valuable as literature in themselves, but it is as records of different stages of the language that we appreciate them, and the chronological study of those in the East-Midland dialect cannot but give us a clear idea of the historical development of our tongue. The selections from works in the



*lust*; 342, "she" for "it" (cf. "English as *she* is spoke"); 616, *blete*, cf. glossary; 744 is mistranslated; on 845, *þene*, note and glossary are both wrong (cf. Stratmann's Dictionary), and in next line for *þu*, corrected to *wu* in note and to *Hu*, p. 536, read with Jesus MS *Nu*; 850, "goeth" for "go," plural; 905, *peode* = "people," as glossary, not "land"; 1638, *wear* = "cautious," not "aware (sure)"; 1640, *mist* = "missest," not "mixest"; finally, 1756, *wis-dom* would better be separated; it is omitted in glossary, though occurring again in 1766. There are so many errors in the notes to the "Owl and Nightingale" that one might readily believe that they were prepared by some foreigner, or tyro, and not by either of the editors. There are no notes on "Havelok the Dane" after 547, although there are 200 lines more of text, and in this line *ful* is plainly "very" and not "foul" as in note, which would be mere tautology.

The glossary consists of nearly 200 pages, and while quite full and very useful, has some mistakes in alphabetical arrangement and several omissions: *bletcaed* comes after *blac*, and under *blesse*, "See *Bletsed*" should be *bletcaed*, there being no *bletsed*. A serious mistake occurs under the preceding word: *bleowu*, I 195, *hit wex and bleowu (bleowu) in iudea*, from *blowen*, to bloom, is put along with *bleu*, from *blowen*, to blow, under *bleowen*, with a reference to *blawe*, and the verb *blowen*, to bloom, is omitted entirely. On p. 384, col. 2, from *crabbe* to *cristendom* is misplaced and should come after *couerture*, col. 1; *faeston*, 2, 139, pt. pl. from *faesten*, is put under *faestned*, 2, 33, pt. part. from *faestnien*, and *faesten* is omitted; on p. 409, col. 2, from *galwe-tre* to *gastelich* is misplaced, and should come after *galun*, col. 1; *scapeloris* and *scæde*, p. 476, col. 1, are also misplaced; so *welkede*, p. 519, col. 1, *wet*, *wete*, p. 521, col. 1, and on p. 534, col. 2, from *þescung* to *þet*. The proof-reading is, therefore, seriously at fault, as these errors might easily have been avoided, and the book bears marks of haste in preparation. The following omissions in glossary have been observed, but I have not in all cases noted the reference: *alle*, hall, 6, 188, unless we should read *halle*, but Layamon was one of the first cockneys; *arehþe*, 16, 1716; *apestreð*, 1, 168; *bedesang*, 5, 1450; *belden*, verb; *bi-smitted*, 9, 113; (the reference 9, 139 is wrongly placed under *buþ*, is, instead of *buþ*, buys); *chere*, 8 b, 19, though given under *en chere*; *cherde*, 16, 1658, though *charen* is given; *dageð*, 4 c, 60; *deorchin* (reference under *dierchin* should be 1, 52); *derewurðe*, 1, 161, -lice, 1, 11; *drihtful*; *drit*, 17, 682; *duheðe*, 8 a, 10; *dwales*, 14, 414; *dwilde*, 5, 1499; *eir*, 17, 606; *erffe*, 5, 1068, but *erue* is given; (*folcninge* is wrongly placed under *folc*); *fullfremedd*, 5, 1576; *geme*, but *þeme* is given; *goulen*, 17, 454; *greue*, 9, 226; *hefiþ*, 5, 1442; (under *hennes*, "gen. s." should be acc. pl.); *houeð*, 12, 69; *i-cundur*, 16, 85; *ikindled*, 12, 16; *late*, adv., 17, 691; *lift*, adj., 4 a, 77; *hit*, adj., 4 d, 13; *mose*, 16, 69; *noise*, 9, 42; *on-walde*, 3 b, 68, but *anwalde* is given; *purses*, 9, 197; *ran*, 17, 691; under *schote* [*schotte*] we find "read *scholde*, 2 pt. s. subj. should," without reference, which should be 14, 411, and the explanation is wrong; *scholde* here = scold (cf. Stratmann, s. v. *scolde*), as the connection plainly shows; *sleateð*, 9, 63; *sleðrende*, 4 b, 100; *sol*. [= *solidos*], 2, 79, and no explanatory note; *strene*, though referred to under *istreoned*; *sum-chere*, 8 a, 14; *swal*, 16, 7; *teleþ*, 14, 237; *tobilimmpeþþ*, 5, 1657; (*to-skeþredd*, 5, 1498, is explained by White as "scattered" rather than "scared away," though the former may be derived from the latter); *to-tose*, 16, 70; *tukest*, 16, 63; (under *þeo*, 9, 23, *þeo þet* = she that, is wrongly placed with *þeo þet* = those

that); *priser*, 17, 514, and in text comma should be placed after *priser* and omitted after 515; *modaŋti*, 8 a, 10, and *amwed*, 8 a, 10, should be *amwēŋ*, as in text; *am-wiŋter*, 16, 218 (cf. 16, 339); *amweneke*; *amweneke*, 14, 444; *wake*, 14, 418; under *wake* the meaning "ways, kinds," as in 16, 72, is omitted; *weneke*, 14, 438; *wes* [= *wis*], 16, 743; *wis*, power, 6, 126; *wiŋkeŋ*, 9, 60; *wis-dan*, 16, 1756, 1766; *wode*, wood, 16, 76; *wodemake*, 16, 1659; cf. Stratmann for this word, and s. v. *wendi*, for *wundi*, 8 a, 42, *windi*, 8 b, 55, which last is omitted in glossary; (for *ŋwe* see above, and cf. *grinŋŋ*); *ŋamerr*, 16, 415; *ŋwŋlŋŋer*, 16, 40. The number of words omitted in No. 16, "Owl and Nightingale," confirms the opinion expressed above that a 'prentice hand must have had to do with its editing. The glossary, therefore, needs revision as well as the notes, but the difficulty of preparing such a glossary must be considered, and notwithstanding some sixty omissions in it, and the corrections needed elsewhere, teachers will be grateful for the book, hoping that the second edition will show a decided improvement.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Von ERNEST SCHRAEDER. Mit einem Beitrage von DR. PAUL HAUPT. Zweite umgearbeitete und sehr vermehrte Auflage. Nebst chronologischen Beigaben, zwei Glossaren, Registern und einer Karte. Giessem, J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1883.

This new edition of a well-known book chronicles the advance which ten busy years have made in a new science. The volume has grown larger by more than 200 pages, and the old matter has been thoroughly worked over, so that the student of the Bible history and religion will find much that is fresh,

besides that is stated with a precision and a confidence—or a caution, it may be—which were lacking before. But the chief progress is in the general outlines of Assyrian grammar were indeed known go, but there was a large degree of uncertainty—only in part recognizing the nice details of etymology and syntax, and this unfortunate some Semitic scholars a distrust of the whole science, which yields at slowly to the efforts of those who are trying to substitute more facts for the somewhat hasty and haphazard statements of linguistic by which the earlier discussions were marred. As a contribution to the understanding of Assyrian lexicography and grammar, the book before is of some value.

Schraeder has strengthened his book by incorporating into it Dr. (now Dr. Haupt's edition of the Flood Tablet (transcription, translation and commentary, with a separate glossary), and many brilliant suggestions in other parts of the work are due to the same hand. The two preserve, notwithstanding, their independence, and each has full authority in his own domain. The two transcriptions are different. Schraeder gives the words in connected sentences, showing the division into syllables corresponding to the cuneiform characters in a particular case; thus the first line of the first Creation-tablet is given *am-mu 1-ŋi 2-ŋi 3-ŋi 4-ŋi 5-ŋi 6-ŋi 7-ŋi 8-ŋi 9-ŋi 10-ŋi*; only the ideograms are transliterated in cuneiform divisions. Haupt on the other hand endeavors to give the pronunciation, and this is the same as for various possible groupings of

cuneiform signs; thus the first line of the Flood-tablet reads (p. 55): *Izdubar ana šāšu-ma izdakra ana Samaš-napišti rūki*; (Schrader's method would give: *Is-du-bar a-na ša-šu-ma izzak-ra a-na Samaš-napišti ru-u-ki*). It is obvious that Haupt's method presupposes an accurate determination of syllabic laws and grammatical forms, and that it puts the reader one remove farther away from the original documents. If a uniform plan were to be followed we should have no hesitation in calling Schrader's the safer, and therefore the preferable, but the combination of the two within the same book-covers is instructive. It should be said that Haupt, in his Glossary, follows Schrader's plan. Except in this respect the transcriptions are guided by the same principles. It is, however, to be noted in detail that while Haupt represents the Assyrian  $\pi$  (= Arab.  $\text{Ha}$ ) by  $h$ , Schrader retains  $\dot{h}$ , which seems less appropriate; that Schrader's  $i$  is Haupt's  $\dot{i}$ ,—the latter being ably defended, and having the great merit of simplicity and convenience of pronunciation; and that Schrader's  $ai$  is Haupt's  $\dot{a}$ , to which we are less inclined to agree.

A prominent place is taken by the proper names which are discussed. The Assyrian form of borrowed names offers various matters of interest. Within certain limits we find scrupulous exactness, *e. g.*: *Apku* = Aphek, *Ahabbu* = (Ahab) Ahab (with the last consonant doubled by reason of the case-ending), *Akibi* = Akzib, *Du'ru* = Dôr, *Mēnihinmu* = (Menachem) Menahem, *Šurru* = Tsôr, *i. e.* Tyre, etc.

Neither can it be attributed to inexactness, or to a defective ear, when we find *Asdudu* for Ashdôd, *Iskalluna* for Ashkalon, *Šamirina* for Shômerôn (Samaria), etc., for this results from the remarkable, but apparently secure fact, that the Assyrians (as distinguished from the Babylonians), had so far departed from the original values of their signs as to pronounce the *s*-signs with *sh*, and the *sh*-signs with *s*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For this interchange see Schrader, "Ueber die Aussprache der Zischlaute im Assyrischen," in the Monatsbericht der K. p. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, March, 1877. We have observed, in the book before us, many cases which bear on the question: (1) The following show *s* in Assyrian for *sh* in Hebrew: p. 84, *Muski*, later and more often *Muski* = Meshek (see KGF. 155 ff.); p. 86, *Kusu* = Cush; p. 102, *Palastam*, *Pilista* = Philistim; p. 145, *Saba'* = Sheba; p. 161, *Ursalimnu* = Jerushalem; p. 162, *Asdudu* = Ashdôd; pp. 163, 287, *Lakisu* = Lakish; p. 163, *Samsi-muruna* = Shômerôn-Merôn (?); p. 165, *Iskalluna* = Ashkalôn; p. 189, *Menas* = Menashsheh; *Ba'sa* = Baesha; p. 191, *Samirina* = Shômerôn; p. 260, *Ansi* = Hoshea. (2) The following cases show *s* in Assyrian for  $\text{sh}$  in Hebrew: p. 148, *Mas'*, *Mas'ai* = Mas(h)s(h)a; p. 150, *Sir'lai* = Is(h)rael; p. 158, *Sirara* = S(h)iryôn; *Saniru* = S(h)anir. (3) The following show *s* in Hebrew for *sh* in Assyrian: p. 240, Tiglathpileser = *Tuk-lat-pal-ēšarra*; p. 266, Shalmaneser (last syll.) = *Šalmanu-uššir*; p. 327, Thelassar = *Til-Aššur*; p. 332, Asarhaddon = *Aššur-aš-iddina*; p. 376, Asnapper = *Aššurbanipal* (?); p. 392, Sargon = *Sarrukin*; p. 411, segânim = *šaknāt*; p. 424, šipsar = *dupšarru* (or *dupšarru*?). (4) The following show *sh* in Assyrian for *s* ( $\text{D}$  or  $\text{w}$ ) in Hebrew: p. 138, *Dimaški*, *Dimaška* = Dammesek ( $\text{w}$ ); pp. 269, 396, *Sab'd* = Seve' (AV. So, with  $\text{D}$ ). (5) The following show *sh* in Hebrew for *s* in Assyrian: p. 366, Shemiramôth = *Sammuramat*; p. 384, Karkemish = *Gargamis*, *Kargamis*; p. 266, Shalmaneser (first syll.) = *Šalmanu-uššir*; p. 319, Rabshakeh = *rabsak* (or *rabsak*?). (6) The following have *s* in both: p. 285, Sanherib = *Sin-ašl-ērba*; p. 357, Sais = *Sani*; p. 382, Sanballat = *Sin-(u)ballit*. (7) The following have *sh* in both: pp. 288, 294, Ushu = *Ušū* (?); p. 329, Shareser = *Sar-ušur*; p. 427, Rôsh = *Rāši* (?).

A comparison of *Babylonian* texts with the Hebrew leads, as is known, to an entirely different result. Here *sh* corresponds to *sh*, and *s* to *s*. It must be remembered, further, that the foregoing applies only to words directly *borrowed*. The sibilants in roots common to the two languages are represented by the corresponding characters, *sh* by *sh* and *s* by *s*.

The above note was written before we had seen a discussion of the subject by Prof. Haupt (Nachrichten der Gött. Gesellschaft der Wiss., Apr. 25, 1883), in which a view divergent from





Anm., give the etymology of Tiglathpileser, *i. e.* *Tukulti-abal-ēšarra* = "Trust (object of trust) is the son of the Šarra-temple." *Sarra* is further explained as an Akkad. word = Assyr. *šābu, ašāru*, "good." (We do not know on what grounds Haupt, *Akkadische Sprache*, 1883, p. xxxv, says: "Der Grundbegriff der akkad. Wurzel *šar* ist 'zusammenbringen.' Auch *ēšara* heisst nicht 'Haus der Gnade,' sondern 'Haus der Versammlung.'") We believe with Schrader that in the form *tukulti* the suffix need not be found (*tukultt* is therefore unnecessary); but the suggestion (p. 241, Anm.) that *tuklat*, st. constr. may be the better reading, and the sense be "Servant of the Son of the Šarra temple," is worthy of very careful consideration. ("Diener des Sarra-Tempels," p. 241, last line, is of course a printer's error for "Diener des Sohnes des Šarra-Tempels.") *Salmānu-uššir* (Shalmaneser), p. 266, is explained as "Shalman, be gracious!" St. Guyard (*Journ. As.* VII, 15, 1880, p. 49 ff.) is followed in the derivation of *uššir* (Imper. Pa.) from *mašāru*—a *Pe Mem* verb, like a *Pe Nun*. Without raising any objection to the form, as such, we confess that the evidence for the meaning "be gracious," from the verb *mašāru*, is not quite convincing. *umaššir* (Impf. Pa.) is used repeatedly in the sense of "to leave," "abandon"; only in connection with *ana napīšti*, as far as we have observed, does it mean "to leave alive," "to spare." The noun *uššuru* doubtless has a meaning kindred with this, but the same question arises, as in regard to *uššir*—does it really come from *mašāru*? So in regard to *ušēru* (*uššēru*), cited by Guyard, from IR XXII, l. 113. If *muššir* is to be read on the Flood-tablet, I 21, that would look like Imper. Pa. of *mašāru*, and so far render this root for *uššir* unlikely. On p. 284 we have a discussion of "Adrammelek" and "Anammelek." The former is explained as *Adar-malik*, the latter as *Anu-malik* ("Adar or Anu is prince"). The difficulty here is not so much in the identification of Adar with NINEB, which is very likely, although not yet absolutely demonstrated (Schrader in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der k. s. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil. Hist. Cl.*, 1880, pp. 19 ff.), but in the fact that these deities are called "gods of Sepharvaim" (*i. e.* *Sippara*), in 1 Kings, XVII, 31, while we know that the two deities especially worshipped at Sippara were *Samaš* and *Anunit* (see pp. 279, 280)—a point which Prof. Tiele has already urged (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, March, 1883). If, then, 1 Kings, XVII, 31 is trustworthy—and there is certainly no sufficient reason for questioning it—it seems doubtful whether the explanation above given of "Adrammelek" and "Anammelek" can be correct. On the other hand we are not aware of any grounds for believing *Adu*, or *Adu-malku*, to be a name of *Samaš* (Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, I, p. 524, note. Eng. Trans. p. 514 f. note. Hommel, *Semit. Völker u. Sprachen*, I 2, p. 245), except the precarious ones that *Samaš* was worshipped at Sippara, and that *Adra-hasis* (*Hasisadra*), the hero of the Flood, was called also *Samaš-napīstim*. There is perhaps more reason for following the scholars just named in regarding *Anammelek* as corrupted from *Anunit-malkat*. We must be allowed to doubt the interpretation of *Il* (p. 284) as a chief god. It is probably generic, and not a proper name at all.

But most of the author's treatment of proper names seems judicious and right. *E. g.* *Phûl* = *Pulu* (p. 230), *Sanherib* = *Sin-ahî-êrib* (or *êrba*) (p. 285),—any other interpretation for *êrib* than "multiply" can hardly be thought of in earnest (cf. G. Evans, *Essay on Assyriology*, 1883, p. 62)—*Nisrôk* = *Ἀσραχ*



= *Asur* (p. 329)—as at least more plausible than anything yet suggested; Halévy's suggestion of "Nesôk" as the proper reading is ingenious, but not satisfactory (Doc. rel. de l'Assyrie, etc., 1882, Commentary, p. 36.) Asnapper = *Asurbanipal* (p. 376), Sanballat = *Sin-(u)ballit* (p. 382), Sargon = *Sarrukin* (p. 392), Nebo = *Nabû* = *Nabium* (?) (p. 412)—and many besides. We dismiss the subject of proper names, after calling attention to the testimony borne on p. 167 to the Shemitic character of the Philistine names, and the natural inference as to the race to which the Philistines belonged.

No Assyrian glossaries have yet been published which compare in value with those appended to this book. Besides their obvious use for readers of the text, they afford material for testing Assyrian lexicography and grammar at some of the most important points.

(a) They give us new and abundant proof of the Akkadian influence manifest in the Assyrian vocabulary. We select a few cases almost at random: P. 493 (Gloss. I, by Haupt) gives the following examples—omitting proper names: *abkallu*, "prince," *lkallu*, "temple," *uda*, "daylight," *adagur*, as sacrificial vessel; p. 544 (Gloss. II, Schrader), *ginû*, "garden," *giparu*, "darkness"; p. 545, *dupšarru*, "tablet-writer"; p. 597, *šurmēnu*, a tree, etc., etc. This is, however, a familiar matter. The explanation of *šarru*, "king," from the Sumerian *šêr* (Akkad. *šêr*), which Haupt for the first time clearly proposed in his *Sintfluthbericht*, 1881, p. 25 f. (cf. Lotz, *Tig. Pil.*, 1880, p. 99), is maintained here by himself (p. 520), and not rejected by Schrader (p. 592, cf. p. 23). Certainly, no sufficient objection has yet been brought against it.

(b) They bear witness to the right of the Assyrian vocabulary to claim from the Shemitic lexicographers equal attention with the other Shemitic languages. We will not pause to enumerate cases, where even the latest Hebrew lexicon (Gesenius, 9th ed., by Mühlau and Volck, 1882-83) has ignored Assyrian words entirely parallel with the Hebrew. In not a few of these the neglect has been fatal to a correct etymology. But this is a subject by itself. (Cf. 7 articles by Friedrich Delitzsch, on "The Importance of Assyriology to Hebrew Lexicography," in the *Athenæum*, May 5, 12, 26, June 9, July 21, 28, and August 25, 1883).

(c) But most interesting of all is the material offered us for constructing the Assyrian paradigms, and particularly those of verbs. The various species of the strong verb are fairly well represented.<sup>1</sup> The absence of an Aphel, whether in strong or in weak verbs, is clearly manifest. The most commonly used species are the Kal, Isteal, and Piel. The Shafel is not infrequent, and the Nifal occurs repeatedly. There are numerous instances of Istaal. Ishtafal, Ittafal and Iftanaal occur rarely, and we have observed no instance of Iftaneal, Ishtanafal, or Ittanafal. Of tenses, the imperfect and present are abundantly illustrated; the permansive (perfect) occasionally. The precative occurs often.

Of especial importance are the indications of the influence and treatment of weak letters in verbal inflection. It is well known that *h* is the only guttural which always appears. The others are reduced to the simple breathing, = *κ*.

<sup>1</sup> It is to be noticed with satisfaction that while Haupt has given up the nomenclature proposed by him for the Assyrian verbal species (SFG. 64, Anm. 1), neither Schrader nor Haupt adopts the system of numbers employed by Lotz (*Tig. Pil.* I, see especially p. vi). The names here used are identical with those in use in Hebrew, as far as this is possible.

(The nomenclature first proposed by Haupt (SFG. 48, 3), and now becoming general is:  $\aleph_1$  = 'Aleph;  $\aleph_2$  = He;  $\aleph_3$  = weaker Cheth;  $\aleph_4$  = 'Ayin;  $\aleph_5$  = Gain.) The following examples of impf. 3d pers. will illustrate the points referred to, and at the same time the disappearance of the preformative: Pe Guttural,  $\aleph_1$ , *illik* (fr. *aldu*, 1st pers. *alikh*, *alikh*), but also *imur*, *imur* (fr. *amdu*). Similarly  $\aleph_2$  and  $\aleph_3$ .  $\aleph_4$  gives *eli* (cf. Heb. עֵלִי), *imid* (cf. Heb. עִמֵּד).  $\aleph_5$  gives *irub* (cf. Heb. עִרַב). 'Ayin Guttural,  $\aleph_1$ ,  $\aleph_2$ ,  $\aleph_3$ , e. g. *uma'ir* (fr. *ma'du*), but also *isr* (from *sdu*).  $\aleph_4$  gives *ibll* (cf. Heb. בִּלְלָה). Lamed Guttural,  $\aleph_1$ ,  $\aleph_2$ ,  $\aleph_3$ , e. g. *ihll* (fr. *hdu*, but cf. *phll* = Heb. חָלַל, and  $\aleph_4$  and  $\aleph_5$ , *hdu*, *phdu*, *thdu*).

The final vowel is lengthened in all Lamed Aleph stems, thus: \**lama'u*. "to hear," is *lamu*, \**da'u*, "to go out," is *du*, etc. Lamed Waw generally the same. Lamed Yod either the same or as follows: *am* (root לָמַד), *akh* (root כָּבַד). Of Pe Yod we have *du*, etc.; of Pe Waw *usib*, *ittusib*, etc. 'Ayin Waw and Yod give *uklu* (fr. *hdu* = \**hawdu*) etc.

It would be instructive to go very much more into detail, and to draw some of the obvious conclusions from the grammatical facts put before us in this valuable book. But enough has perhaps been said to indicate that it is indispensable not merely to the student of Biblical history, not merely even to the student of Assyrian, but also to those who care for general Shemitic grammar, and that it offers interesting and suggestive phenomena to all who have a taste for the study of language.

FRANCIS BROWN.

---

Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. Neunte Auflage, neu bearbeitet von F. MÜHLAU und W. VOLCK, ord. Professoren der Theologie an der Universität Dorpat. Leipzig, F. C. W. Vogel, 1883.

The appearance of each successive edition of the time-honored Hebrew hand-lexicon, whose foundation was laid more than sixty years ago by the industry and common sense of Gesenius, should be not only of great moment for Hebrew and Old Testament study, but also of the very first importance for Semitic linguistic science generally. The Hebrew language, mainly on account of the literature which it embodies, has been, and it is safe to say always will be, studied in the Western World more than all the other Semitic dialects put together. But for the proper understanding of Hebrew, a knowledge of the related tongues is indispensable, and in every comprehensive Hebrew dictionary all the new facts that can be gained from any of them to illustrate Hebrew phonology, etymology, or sematology must be accurately and judiciously presented. Hence it happens that the deservedly most popular of the Hebrew lexicons furnishes to its editors an unequalled opportunity of giving to the world a succinct record of comparative Semitic study. This fact they seem to have recognized, as they claim in the preface to have subjected the etymological and phonological matter of the previous editions to a thorough revision, and to have paid special attention to the latest results of Assyriological research. The importance of the subject demands that the representative work before us be subjected to a close and faithful scrutiny.

The first thing to be noted in this latest edition is the improvement which has been effected in the increased number of citations of illustrative passages.

A great desideratum has also been supplied by the affixing of a cross (†) to the articles in which all the proof passages are cited. The student is thus enabled to see at a glance how often the rarer words occur, and in what period of the history of the language. In the previous editions it was often impossible, without the aid of a concordance, to find out even whether words with but one citation were really ἀπαξ. λεγ. The editors refer to their diligent use of concordances in this connection, and this is no doubt indispensable. But in Hebrew lexicography, at least, one has still to depend much on private collections, and we have to point out here a most singular instance of human fallibility in this kind of work. It might seem almost incredible, but it is nevertheless a fact, that a whole article is wanting in this and the earlier editions of the present work as well as in all other lexicons we have examined. No notice whatever is taken of the Chaldee word ܐܝܪ, "elder," which occurs in no less than five places (Ezra 5, 5. 9; 6, 7. 8. 14), once in the emphatic and four times in the construct plural. An explanation of this phenomenon is perhaps to be found in the fact than in the Hebrew and Chaldee concordances of Baer and Fürst the word is cited under ܐܝܪ, while the related words in Hebrew are forms of ܐܝܪ. However this may be, the fact itself is most instructive and suggestive for the makers and users of dictionaries generally. It would not, of course, be so worthy of remark if the Hebrew and Biblical Chaldee vocabulary were not so limited and so easily brought under control.

Very little progress is to be recorded in the explanation of doubtful words and phrases. This is to be expected as long as the editors confine themselves to an elucidation of the traditional Massoretic text without considering any proposed emendations. One can understand why such a position should be taken and held in order to avoid confusion and to keep out a supposed new element of uncertainty. None the less is the position unscientific, and in the present state of these studies indefensible. If there are cases in which either the traditional forms of words or their traditional explanation are clearly or probably wrong, the facts ought to be mentioned along with the best attempts that have been made at emendation. It seems hardly proper that a reading which makes no sense should be retained as part of the Hebrew lexical material. For example, it is as plain as day that the text which lay before the LXX in 1 Sam. 20, 19 was the original, as Wellhausen has shown, but the editors still give ܐܝܪ ܐܝܪ instead of ܐܝܪ ܐܝܪ (cf. LXX with v. 41), and get rid of the additional grammatical difficulty of the Massoretic text by omitting the article from before ܐܝܪ. The effect of this is not simply to give a locality to Palestine which never existed, but also a new word to the vocabulary, for the noun ܐܝܪ, "Weggang," does not elsewhere occur. It is hard to see, again, why the translation of the LXX, σκιάσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμῶν for ܐܝܪ ܐܝܪ in 2 Sam. 20, 6 should not be adopted. It is certain that the original form was ܐܝܪ in any case, as no vowel letters were written between two consonants in the same syllable (cf. Bleek-Wellhausen, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 633 ff.), and we have to choose between the above natural and expressive image, and the following: "(damit er nicht) unser Auge wegreisse, für: damit er sich nicht unserem Auge entziehe." These are only random specimens of the results to which an ignoring of the textual criticism of the Old Testament leads when the lexical treatment of the material is concerned.

The article **רֶשֶׁף** is carried over from the preceding edition without alteration, but here again an important province of Semitic research is ignored; the whole article should in fact be rewritten. A reference to Levy's little "Phönizisches Wörterbuch" alone would show that **רֶשֶׁף חַץ** was the special name of a Phœnician divinity, a fact which is at least striking enough to be cited along with **רֶשֶׁף מִי קִשָּׁה**, Ps. 76, 4. Resep was, in fact, the Phœnician (and probably the Canaanitish) Vulcan or Fire-God, i. e. "fire" or "flame" personified. That it should have been mentioned in connection with the very obscure and difficult passage, Job 5, 7 *ב*, is obvious. It is also worth mentioning that in another interesting passage where the word occurs (Hab. 3, 5) **רֶבֶר**, "pestilence," is employed as its parallel—the term which in the far East the Assyrians seem to have personified as the Pest-God Dibbara.

Greater fullness and exactness are still to be desired in many articles. The treatment of **קֶנֶן** and **רֹאשׁ** may be noted as specially defective. For the former word the large "Thesaurus" of Gesenius may still be consulted with great advantage, and it would have been well to cite Neh. 3, 34. 5, 10. In general it may be said that the later books of the Canon are not sufficiently represented, either in the dictionaries or grammars. For the latter word, which has a much wider figurative use than would appear from our lexicon, such additional shades of meaning as are found in 1 Sam. 28, 2; 1 Chr. 16, 7; 24, 31; 2 Chr. 13, 12 should have been given. Of other words, defectively treated, we note the following: No explanation of **נוֹא** is given which suits the familiar phrase in 1 Sam. 17, 12. **חֲצֹה עַל**, Gen. 33, 1, means "he distributed among," but neither under the preposition nor the verb are these special meanings indicated. In Esth. 9, 25 **עַל** can only have an instrumental meaning, which is absent from the otherwise excellent article upon that preposition. The primary notion of **בְּ** "in comparison with" comes out in at least one passage, 2 S. 18, 3, where it is equivalent to **בְּנִי** Is. 40, 17, but this sense has been quite overlooked.

Some errors in regard to the use of words are important enough to be cited. **קָטַח** is said to be used in Deut. 21, 12 of trimming the beard, where the subject of the verse is a woman. It is really employed there of trimming the nails, as also in the original text of 2 S. 19, 25, according to the showing of the LXX. **אֶרֶב**, in Gen. 25, 30, is not used "of the reddish-brown color of a man," but of Jacob's famous mess of pottage. In 2 Sam. 18, 22 **בְּשָׂרָה** cannot mean "message" as in v. 20, but only "a messenger's reward" as in 4, 10. The statement that **חֶסֶד** in the sense of "love of man to God" is "very rare" is hardly true. Besides the passages quoted it occurs frequently in the later books, e. g. 2 Chr. 6, 42; 32, 32 al., and is moreover the prevailing sense in the secondary derivatives.

The chief claim the editors make for the present edition is the advance made in the etymological portion. That something has been done to make Semitic etymology more respectable cannot be denied; but it is yet far from the level which might be reached upon thoroughly scientific methods. The advantages which the editors possess are the inherited labors of their predecessors, especially of the late Franz Dietrich, who was certainly the most thorough Semitic etymologist of the last generation, and who edited the fifth, sixth, and seventh editions of the present work. Of scholars still living, they have drawn chiefly from the veteran Fleischer, who, from his stores of Arabic learning, has brought

... upon the primary ideas of some important Semitic ... have the advantage of the recent researches into ... have until lately been but little known, such as local ... and Ethiopic that have been worked up by D. H. ... Trumpp and others, and above all the Assyrio- ... non-Semitic Akkadian, to which the Semitic vocabulary ... The main deficiencies to be remarked in this as ... are, first, the lack of a thorough and rational theory of ... the Semitic roots, and of the characteristic principles of ... second, the want of consistent etymological and philological ... of direct controlling acquaintance with some of the ... dialects, notably of the Assyrian.

... the first point it must be said that although the old theory of ... and not mere abstractions must be given up, the great ... the Semitic as well as in other linguistic systems, certain ... of sounds stand for general ideas, and (broadly speaking) ... combinations by added sounds ("determinatives") gives ... significance to the respective forms. It is not necessary for ... to have any special theory even as to whether the longer or ... were the earlier. The only postulate required is that there *was* ... in the development of linguistic forms as well as of the corres- ... primitive civilization. This being granted, it may be expected ... so extraordinarily rich in significant sounds and so compara- ... phonetic decay as the Semitic, the system of root-reduction ... All that is needed is a patient collection of facts, and ... by trained philologists. Such a system for the Proto-Semitic ... the later history of the main dialects, was for the first time ... consistently and proved in detail in my book "Aryo-Semitic ... ago, and it is gratifying to note that the successive editions ... through the accumulating force of individual objective ... approaching the positions there taken. A few of the most ... may be here recapitulated. First: Semitic "roots" (or ... symbolic significant and independent combinations of sounds) ... purposes viewed as primary or secondary, and the simplest ... consist of a consonant and vowel or of a vowel and consonant. ... was not, as a system, characteristic of the earliest accessible ... neither was any other special type of structure.

... time before the separation of the Semitic tribes, the tri- ... came as a simple matter of convenience to predominate and ... as the ordinary inflective basis, but the tendency to conform ... to this standard was not thoroughly carried out either in ... and a biconsonantal or even a monoconsonantal basis is ... in some of the so-called "weak" forms. Second, there is ... suppose that the stronger gutturals and the "emphatic" explo- ... of the original stock of Semitic sounds, though they were ... before the breaking up of the family. Third, in the develop- ... both vowels and consonants entered as the secondary factors. ... of *a* and *i*, respectively, came 1 and 1', to stand in the

place of the first, second, or third radical when they were not primary, and  $\aleph$ , sometimes changed to  $\gamma$ , performed, though to a less extent, an analogous function for  $\alpha$ . This is self-evidently always the case when the first and third radicals are "strong" letters. In many cases, however,  $\aleph$  and  $\gamma$  at least were independent radicals from the beginning, as true consonants. "Determinative" letters, whether to form biliterals, triliterals, or multiliterals, were placed at the end, and any consonant whatever could fulfil that function. But as *prae-determinatives* only a very few consonants were employed, and these were such as were also employed as formative *inflective* elements, above all  $\aleph$ ,  $s$ ,  $t$ , the new roots thus formed being properly *denominatives*. Of the infixing of a letter between the first and third radical then seems to be no sure proof,  $\eta$  and  $\gamma$  alone can play this rôle, and here it is natural to suppose that they are modifications of  $\aleph$ .

Etymologists have been a good deal ridiculed and often deservedly. But all Semitic scholars must perforce become etymologists, even those who laugh at etymologists in general; and in every Semitic lexicon, the etymological material must be pretty extensive. It is extremely desirable then that it should be accurate, and to secure this end it is necessary that such preliminary fundamental work as that just indicated should be done once for all. The advantage of this systematic treatment is exemplified in the right theory of the root  $\text{כרת}$ , "to cut." The editors say, without mentioning any other view, that the simpler root is perhaps  $\text{כח}$ , they do not give any other instance of an infixed  $\aleph$ , and a great many instances would be necessary, since infixing is either rare or unknown. But, following the general principle above laid down, we soon find that a great number of secondary roots, with the idea of "cutting," "dividing," contain  $\aleph$  as the main elements, and that that is in fact the fundamental notion of the combination from which the later senses of "digging," "hollowing out," etc., are plainly derived. A still more serious error is it when they combine (after Fleischer) a whole set of roots (at  $\text{חח}$ ) having strong letters at the beginning and end and  $\gamma$  in the middle, with a common simpler root  $\text{ח}$  whose alleged meaning, "to twist," "turn," cannot be proved. One of the roots cited,  $\text{חח}$ , does not exist at all in Hebrew, and in the other dialects not in the sense referred to. The supposed Hebrew derivative  $\text{חחח}$  occurs once, Ps. 107. 30, and as a comparison with the corresponding Targ. and Assyrian word (see Lotz on Tigl. I, 52) shows, does not properly mean "haven" at all, but "town, village," and is of uncertain origin.

The root  $\text{שכל}$ , whose true origin we shall mention later, is derived by the editors from the simpler  $\text{ש}$ . They are greatly puzzled, in connection with the much-discussed Hebrew word for God,  $\text{אל}$ , by the discovery that in Assyrian *il* (and Sabaeen *il*) the vowel is short, and say that the root must then be some other than  $\text{אל}$ , "to be strong." The fact is that, correctly speaking, there is no root  $\text{'il}$ . The three consonants may be written *without vowels* to indicate in a symbolical (and in this case only approximate) way the form which lies at the basis of most of the noun and verb stems usually associated with it. If the root is so written it must be understood to represent simply the vowel expansion of a simpler  $\text{לם}$ , to which alone the Semitic *il* can be referred. The false theory that lies at the bottom of such uncertain etymologizing is the supposition that only such a form can be assumed for the "root" as lies, or is supposed to lie,



at the basis of *verb* stems. The Semitic lexicon really starts with *nouns of action*, and all of its verbs are, strictly speaking, a sort of denominatives. Most of the so-called derivatives from Ayin Vau verbs it is impossible, as in the case before us, to derive from them directly, and yet such is the condition of current Semitic etymology and its terminology that it is necessary to correct the editors here, and to say that after all they are wrong in supposing that מל (il) is not derived from מל!

The main etymological defect of the whole work, however, is that inherited from Dietrich, namely, the tendency to overdo the etymologizing. It is amazing what combinations are sometimes made in order to bring an immense stock of roots with similar letters under the same primary root, when the meanings alleged to be related are only brought together by a stretch of fancy. Almost every "Ayin Doubled" root gives occasion for an exercise of this kind, though occasionally one is more temperately treated, as נר, נר. It is hard, again to understand what the editors mean when, after citing proofs at ירע that the word is *not* the same as the Arabic *wada'a*, "to place," they say: "nevertheless the Arabic *wada'a* can afford us the ground-meaning of ירע." But even if the comparison were admissible after they have proved that it is not, it would be hard to see how "placing" can have anything to do with knowing. They say, after Schultens, that it means "placing in the mind"; but in this case, not to mention other objections, the essential idea has been interpolated.

It will now be in place to note a few derivations of actual words. דם, "blood," is derived from דמה. This means "to be like," and the problem is to bring these notions together. "To be like" is "to be level," i. e., of course, "level with the ground." A thing is made level with the ground by "pushing" or "pressing," from which we get the notion of "pressing together," and so "making close." The notion of being "dark" is connected with being "close" and "thick," and what is "blood" but something "dark-red" and "thick"? This is only a small part, however, of what the root דם is made to yield. Nobody can disprove all this, but some of the transitions of meaning are, to say the least, rather violent.

An error which, as far as we know, is found in all the dictionaries, is to be pointed out in the derivation of שַׁמְרָה, "eye-lid," found once and in the plural (Ps. 77, 5), as the editors have forgotten to note. This is connected with שָׁמַר, "to guard," as though it meant "the guard" of the eye. There are two fatal objections to this. First, the form is that of the part. pass. so that it must have meant "the *guarded* thing," which is unsuitable. Second, the word comes out in Syriac with an original *th* sound: *thimrā*, and has the same consonants in its Targumic form. The root is, in fact, unknown, and as the *ā* is written defectively, it is not certain that the Massoretic form is correct. The current etymology of the quadrilateral חָרַם, "to interpret," "translate," is certainly wrong; and the way in which it arose is an interesting study. The simpler root רָגַם in Hebr. Aram. and Arabic means "to stone," as a capital punishment. Hence it has been supposed that it originally meant "to throw," then "to throw over," and then "to translate." But it never means "to throw" simply, but "to throw *stones*," or "to stone." In Ezek. 23, 47; 1 K. 12, 18 the word for "stone" is a "cognate accusative," and the meaning "jaculari," attributed in the lexicon to the Chaldee, is a mistake. It also never means "to throw

over," much less "to translate." It has been attempted to deduce the famous longer word from an Indo-European root which would bring it remotely into connection with our *talk*, but here the many necessary historical links are left to the imagination. If the word is Semitic, and if a derivation is insisted on, it is best to connect it with Assy. *ragāmu*, "to cry out," "shout." Comparing this (Haupt, *Sintfluth-Glossar* in KAT<sup>2</sup>, p. 517) with the same root in Ethiopic and Arabic, where it means "to curse,"<sup>1</sup> it is plain that the idea of "speaking" must have intervened; vgl. Hebr. קנב, "to curse," with Assy. *qebā*, "to speak," A. S. *andswarian*, "to answer," with *swerian*, "to swear." קנול, "the Flood," is still derived from ינל, but the Eth. *mā'bal*, "billow," "billows," from a root קנל, seems to throw doubt upon this view. The root שכל, already mentioned, can only be a secondary from the kindred primitive כל; vgl. שכלה, "stream," "flood." The origin of קשרה, "pan," 2 Sam. 13, 9, is stated to be obscure, but Wellhausen has already acutely and satisfactorily explained it as = "dough-place," standing for *mas'eret*. The old derivation of פנה, "face," from the similar-sounding root meaning "to turn," reverses the true order, for the latter is a denominative from the former, as the Arab. derived V. conj. of *wagāha*, "to turn towards," is also a denominative from *wagāh*, "face." The problem is solved when we find that the Assy. *pānu*, "face," is the strict plural form of *pā* (Arab. *fā*, = פה), "mouth," to which it bears the same logical relation as Lat. *ora* does to *os*.

These examples must suffice to suggest how much the etymological portion of the work requires to bring it up to the proper level of method and accuracy. A few words must still be said to show how indispensable it is for Semitic scholars to have a direct acquaintance with Assyrian or rather with the science of Assyriology in its widest sense. Many words, besides those already referred to, receive light, both as to their origin and meaning, from the Assyrian as well as from its local predecessor, the Akkadian. To distinguish between the last two sources and to control the material, generally needs a special training and preparation, and it is surprising how few, comparatively, have devoted themselves to Assyriological studies. The editors have, for this last edition, relied almost entirely upon Schrader's KAT<sup>2</sup>—a work which, with all its excellences, labors under many grammatical and lexical defects; but this they have not used as fully and as intelligently as they might have done. The following are a few errors and deficiencies which we have observed. The now world-wide קנה, "reed," is derived (without mention of any of its Semitic equivalents) from קנה in its hypothetical sense of "standing upright." But, being the same word as the Assy. *qanā*, it comes, as is now notorious, from the Akkad. *gin* = "the bending thing." קפא is derived from כסא, "to cover"; but the word is the Akkad. *gusa*, the equivalent of the Assy. *kūšā*, in the bilingual syllabaries. קנה, "a mina," is an old pre-Semitic Babylonian weight, Akkad. and Assy. *mana* (see, e. g., Delitzsch, *Assyr. Lesestücke*, 2 ed., 77, 36), and has only an accidental association of sound with the Semitic סנה, "to reckon," "assign," from which the lexicon derives it.

<sup>1</sup> This meaning is well established for the Arabic along with the more common sense of "stoning," see, e. g., the Koran, Sura III, 31: "Satan the accursed." This is usually, but wrongly, regarded as being equivalent to "Satan who is worthy of stoning."



The Assyrian must also be often called in to rectify or illustrate words that rarely occur or are doubtful in meaning and origin. For example, *לָדָג*, "banner," is the Assy. *diġu*, evidently of a similar meaning, which is properly "something conspicuous," from Assy. *daġlu*, "to see," "look at" (vgl. Delitzsch in Lotz, Tigl., p. 131 f.). The fact that Assy. *lānu* means "in front of" (c. g. Sennach. II, 77), calls for a new treatment of Hebr. *לִפְנֵי* and *לְפָנָיו*. The Assy. equivalent of *יָד*, "thumb," is *uđnu* and this settles the Proto-Semitic form of the root which the Arab. *ibḥḥu* had put in doubt. The correctness of the traditional form and rendering of the *אָרָא*, *לִי*, *אָרָא* is placed beyond doubt by Assy. *abiktu*, "overthrow," its exact equivalent. Assy. *siġṣu*, "sharp point," shows that the Hebr. and Aram. *אָרָא*, "to impale," "hang aloft," are denominatives. What the Assyrian has contributed to the understanding of Hebrew proper names has become better known, and is more fully indicated in the lexicon.

We have noted a few omissions and mistakes from oversight in addition to those mentioned in the errata. At *אָרָא*, nr. 2, *ל* should be omitted from *אָרָא* in the important syntactical and theological passage cited from Gen. 15, 6. The citation on p. 45 *ל*, line 5 from bottom, should read Ri 9, 37. The plural of *אָרָא*, "secret counsel," and of *אָרָא*, "ornament" (Jer. 3, 19), are omitted, though they are both exceptional forms. The peculiar forms of the Hifil inf. construct found in 2 Sam. 14, 11 are also wanting, as well as the Semitic equivalents for the numeral "four," which are of great phonological importance. All of these oversights are transferred from the preceding edition, as is the omission already mentioned in connection with *אָרָא*.

A word must be said in conclusion in praise of the thorough manner in which the long introductory article, "Von den Quellen," has been worked over for the present edition, where a great deal of new bibliographical material has been added. The attention that has been bestowed upon the geographical and archaeological departments of the lexicon is evident not only here, but throughout the work.

It has been necessary, in the interests of Hebrew and Semitic studies, to dwell upon the shortcomings rather than upon the merits of the work just reviewed. But, taken as a whole, the lexicon as it now stands is, in our opinion, by far the best Hebrew dictionary in existence, and it should either in form or in substance be speedily done into English. If the leading defects to which we have called attention were to be remedied and, in addition, due deference paid to all schools of exegesis and textual criticism which are intelligently and conscientiously seeking to arrive at the truth, the demands of Hebrew students would be fully met by the next edition.

J. F. McCurdy.

iden für den Elementarcursus des Sanskrit mit Uebungstücken und zwei Glossaren, von GEORG BÜHLER. Wien, Verlag von Karl Konegen, 1883.

bler's book may be said to be almost the first practical introduction into cal Sanskrit, published outside of India. It is written in the style of our luctory Latin and Greek books, presenting alternately grammatical lessons ractical exercises in which the student is from the very start brought face e with the living language. When Bühler, a few years ago, came to the

University of Vienna, he commenced with a beginner's class of over fifty students, and so effective and attractive was the easy practical way of his instruction that over thirty of these were still pursuing Sanskrit under him two semesters later. This will be significant to any one who knows how beginners' classes in Sanskrit thin out after the first semester in German universities.

The very great value of the book lies in the graded practical exercises. These are not of the style of 'Ollendorff's method,' but consist either of extracts from the literature, or close imitations of passages actually to be found. Whatever one may say of the grammatical part of the book, this collection of good Sanskrit sentences, undoubtedly the result of a good deal of labor, can always be utilized in recasting the book upon some other plan; or they can be employed in practical exercises in prose composition, after the student has had some acquaintance with the language and can be made to judge the grammatical part of the book for himself.

Certainly the grammatical part will not commend itself to Western scholars generally. To the scholar who has been brought up in India, who believes that the grammatical rules and the forms of Hindu grammarians clear down to the Bhaṭṭikāvya may be expected any day to receive practical illustration, or to turn up somewhere in the literature, the artificialities of the Hindu system seem an evil which can be tolerated. But he who believes only in phonetics, practically capable of illustration in the MSS. and in 'quotable' forms, will gladly and to his profit leave the Hindu grammar to the Hindus and to the special students of native grammar. He will prefer to take from the start the scientific and yet practical European view of Indian language, which certainly becomes unavoidable as soon as one leaves the domain of the classical language and turns to the Vedic Saṁhitas, Brāhmaṇas or sūtras. Another general consideration militates against the introduction into the Hindu system which the book leads to, namely, the actually acquired position of Whitney's Sanskrit grammar. There can be no reasonable doubt that an overwhelming majority of European Sanskrit students, not to speak of the Americans, now actually use this book for daily reference to a large extent, to the exclusion of other grammars. The second edition of the book, with a list of all accessible verbal forms, may be expected at no remote future, and this appendix will enhance the value of Whitney's grammar—one may fairly say it without being accused of clannishness—out of reach of comparison with any other. Now if Bühler's exercises were combined with an introduction to Whitney, his book would be an unmodified blessing indeed. Those who teach Sanskrit according to Whitney's grammar know how difficult and unsatisfactory it is to make the necessary selections for beginners; Bühler with his practical knowledge of how to teach Sanskrit would have guided him better than almost any other scholar.

To be sure, the fault can even now be removed, certainly for English-speaking students. It would not be too difficult a task to employ Bühler's valuable selections and his equally valuable method of grading the lessons, but to transfer these into the framework of Whitney's method. Should there ever appear an English version of the book—and there is some reason to hope that an American scholar will undertake the work—it is hoped that the wish expressed above will not have been uttered in vain, and that Bühler's well-known liberality may permit this free rendering of his valuable book.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ. Aristotle's Psychology in Greek and English, with Introduction and Notes. By EDWIN WALLACE, M. A., Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College, Oxford. Cambridge University Press, 1882.

Hegel brought modern philosophy to the consciousness of the organic oneness of its largest results with the corresponding results of earlier, and especially of Greek, inquiry; and one of the most characteristic features of the philosophic movement in Germany since Hegel's death has been the attempt to comprehend and teach philosophy in and through its history. Accordingly, and as a necessary incident of this attempt, the world—or at least the world of scholars—knows how assiduously and fruitfully German scholarship has been devoted, within the period mentioned, to the critical study of the texts of Greek philosophy, the preparation and publication of new editions and translations, and the elucidation of the same through note and commentary.

English scholars will need a long time to catch up with their German cousins in this field of good works. Meanwhile, all symptoms of a disposition to enter it will be doubly welcome to a growing band of philosophic students, who consciously stand in need of nothing so much as of all fair aids to the ready comprehension of Greek philosophy. It is to such students that Mr. Wallace's work is chiefly addressed, and to them, we say advisedly, it will be invaluable. And for their benefit we may add that main stress is laid by the author on the exhibition of the nature and extent of the contribution made in Aristotle's *περὶ ψυχῆς* to the theory of cognition.

While Mr. Wallace's aim has thus been (in his own words) "explanation, rather than textual criticism," he has not been unmindful of the requirements of the latter. In particular, the views of Torstrik respecting a double recension of the text (see Torstrik's edition of *Arist. de Anima*, Berlin, 1862) have been tested by him, "in regard to several portions of the text," with results expressed by Mr. Wallace as follows: "Without denying the existence of repetition and disorder in much that Aristotle wrote, or rather left in notes, I have tried in several passages to maintain the general correctness of the ordinary text against Torstrik's objections and 'emendations.'"

G. S. M.

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM.

XXXVI 2.

1. Pp. 161-74. F. Reuss. King Arybbas of Epirus. An investigation of the obscurer historical facts of the time of Demosthenes.

2. Pp. 175-7. I. Stich. In Marci Antonini Commentarios. Critical notes based on a recent examination of Italian manuscripts.

3. Pp. 178-95. L. C. M. Aubert. Adnotationes in Senecae Dialogum I. Critical and explanatory.

4. Pp. 196-205. A. Ludwich. Notes on the Birds of Aristophanes. In the much discussed verse 492, L. points out very convincingly that much of the point must lie in the word *νύκτωρ*: there must be a contrast intended between the artisans who obey the seasonable crowing of the cock (*ὅπῳταν νόμον ὀρθριον αἶση*) and those who start out in the night when the cock crows too early. Euelpides then breaks in with an example of what may happen to these latter unfortunates. In accordance with this view L. proposes to write *ἀποδεξάμενοι* for *ὑποδησάμενοι* in 492. But it is hard to see that his explanation, which seems clearly right, applies any better to the changed text than to that of the MSS. Why may we not understand: *οἱ δὲ βαδίζουσ' ὑποδησάμενοι νύκτωρ ὅπῳταν αἶση*? There is a loss of a comic touch in giving up the picture of the man who puts on his boots at midnight. In 525, L. writes *καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς* instead of *κάν τοῖς ἱεροῖς*, a very neat correction.

5. Pp. 206-14. A. Riese. Geographica. Three notes. I. The traditional notion that the Chalybes were the inventors of the use of iron can be traced back to Pliny (H. N. 7, 197), who tells us, after quoting other views, that *alii* ascribed this invention to the Chalybes. Who were these *alii*? Seemingly they were careless readers of Callimachus (Fr. 35 Schneider). Catullus (56, 48 ff.) translates Callimachus as follows: *Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat ET qui principio sub terra quaerere venas institit ac ferri fingere daritiem*. And Catullus had not misunderstood his original: the fragment of Callimachus must be written: *Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος γειόθεν ἀντέλλον τε κακὸν φυτὸν οἱ πρὶν ἐφηναν*. There is *no* authority for the ascription of the invention of the use of iron to the Chalybes. II. The modern word *gorilla* is due to a slip of the pen in the hand of some ancient copyist. We read in the Periplus of Hanno (118), of an island on the west coast of Africa: *νῆσος ἦν μεστὴ ἀνθρώπων ἀγρίων. πολὺ δὲ πλείους ἦσαν γυναῖκες δασεῖαι τοῖς σώμασιν, ὥς οἱ ἐρμηνέες ἐκάλουν Γορίλλας*. Pliny (H. N. 6, 199), who is demonstrably following Hanno, calls these women *Gorgades*. The *ἐρμηνέες* elsewhere were careful to use names of Greek formation. The conclusion is almost irresistible that the name *Gorgades* in Pliny is taken from a correct text of Hanno. III. In the fourth century B. C. (Ephoros, Skylax) the names *Σαυρομάται* and *Συρμάται* (*Σαρμάται*)



I 18, the words ἐς τὰς ναῦς ἐσβάντες are a *glossema*. I 19, the last sentence can only be understood to apply to the Athenians and their allies. I 55, τῶν Κορινθίων (after τῷ πολέμῳ) must be stricken out as a matter of grammar as well as of historical truth. II 22, Πολυμήδης καὶ Ἀριστόνους, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς στάσεως ἑκάτερος, cf. Xen. Hell. 5, 2, 25. II 41, μόνη οὔτε τῷ ἐπελθόντι ἀγανάκτησιν ἔχει—πολεμίῳ before ἐπελθόντι being an interpolation, see Classen on II 36. III 26, δύο καὶ before τεσσαράκοντα must be given up, see chapters 16, 29, 69, 76. III 82, ὡς ἂν ἑκάστοις αἱ μεταβολαὶ τῶν ξυντυχιῶν. IV 67 ff., an interesting note on the text, the topography, the military operations; but without very distinct results. IV, 102, ὅτι περιρρέοντος τοῦ Στρυμόνος, leaving out ἐπ' ἀμφότερα. V 27, ὀλίγους αὐτοκράτορας: that is to say, ἀρχὴν is a gloss on αὐτοκράτορας. V 60, ἐν Νεμέῳ after ἕως ἔτι ἦν ἀθρόον must be stricken out. V 80, τοῦ φρουρίου is a gloss on ἐξω ποιήσας. There is still more in this article which will bear reading by the student of Thucydides.

10. Pp. 260-301. W. Hoerschelmann. Investigations touching the History of the Greek Metrical Writers. An examination of the sources of the scholia to Hephaestion.

11. Pp. 302-28. Miscellany. L. Mendelssohn gives a number of "Trifles." Babrius 75, 6, τὴν αὐριον γάρ, τλήμον, οὐχ ὑπερβήση. Chariton, VII 5, 11, ὀλίγον τε ἐπενδύουν οὐδέν. Polyæn. I 1, 2, ἐνταῦθα πηγαὶ πολλαί, ἰδαί πυκναί. Caes. Bell. Civ. I 22, 5, *ut tribunos plebis nefarie ex civitate expulsos*. Cic. de Leg. II 5, 11, *esse laudabilem quidam talibus argumentis docent*. Val. Max. I 1, 14, *quamque merito sibi infestos dominos*. Vell. Paterc. II 17, 3, *consulatum paene omnium civium suffragiis nactus est*.

A. Ludwich remarks on the metrical characteristics of the Gigantomachia of the Greek poet Klaudianos, and proposes several corrections of the text.

H. Luckenbach, after an examination of the original stone at Verona, gives an exacter text of the epigram, Kaibel, 128.

G. Teichmüller discusses ἐπαναγωγή, ἐπαγωγή and ἐπαναφέρειν, ἐπιφέρειν. Plato uses the compounds with two prepositions, Aristotle with only one. In Plato the words have hardly become technical; in Aristotle they are fully so. Aristotle uses the two prepositions in familiar words, but in strictly scientific terms not grown popular he prefers to cast away useless elements.

E. Hiller has examined the MSS of Schol. Av. Ran. 218, and shows that the only authoritative text is that given in Cod. Venetus 474.

J. Sommerbrodt describes the Florentine MS (Laur. 77) of Lucian. It is a mixture of leaves written at different times by different hands and of very unequal value.

H. Flach writes of the Lives of Roman Authors in Suidas. It appears that these authors either had written or were believed to have written in Greek. The source of the notices was probably the preface to Capito's translation of Eutropius.

O. Ribbeck calls attention to the expressions in Liv. V 21, which suggest that the historian in his account of the taking of Veii is only giving a paraphrase of a *fabula praetextata*.

A. Biese defends *velatum*, Catull. 64, 64. He finds an echo of Catullus in Ovid, Ars. Am. I 525 ff. There (v. 529) we read *tunica velata recincta*. Further,

Catullus himself, at v. 265 of the same poem, seems to recur to the expression of 64.

A. Stachelscheid gives a collation of the notes in Bentley's copy of Macrobius in the British Museum.

A. Man argues briefly that neither Ruggiero nor v. Duha has succeeded in proving anything new about the old course of the river or the situation of the docks at Pompeii.

### XXXVI 3.

I. Pp. 329-42. F. Bücheler. *Coniectanea*. Nine notes. I. Poeta ignotus. In the inscription CIL VI 7574, in the dialogue between Hadrian and Epictetus, published by Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. XIII, p. 561), and in the *Gesta Romanorum*, cap. 36, are found the materials of a distich composed not much later than the time of the Antonines, which may be thus restored: *mala ut in arboribus pendunt, sic corpora nostra aut matura cadunt aut cito acerba ruunt*. A little further on in the same dialogue between Hadrian and Epictetus occur the words: *nuda Venus picta, nudi pinguntur Amores: quibus nuda placet, nudas dimittat oportet*. This is verse, but it is not quite certain how many of the slips may be due to the author. Perhaps something like this may be restored: *nuda Venus, nudi pueri pinguntur Amores: exhibet nudus cui dea nuda placet*.—II. Victor grammaticus. The grammarian referred to by Priscian (I 19) and Rufinus Antiochensis (Gram. Lat. ed. Keil, VI, p. 573, 26) seems to be identical with the man so neatly praised in Anth. Pal. IX 711: *αὐτὴν γραμματικὴν ὁ ζωγράφος ἠθέλει γράψαι, Βίκτορα δὲ γράψας, "τὸν σκοπόν," εἶπεν, "ἔχω"*.—III. The Crispus addressed in Anth. Plan. App. IV 40 is identical with the man addressed by Horace, Od. II 2. In the words *τρισσαὶ Τίχαι* there is a local allusion. Vitruvius (III 2, 2) designates the region of the Horti Sallustiani by the words *ad tres Fortunas*. The sentence *τί γὰρ ἀνδρὶ τοσῶδε ἀρκέσει εἰς ἐτέρων μυρίον εὐφροσύνην*, B. translates: *quae huic satis erit infinitas ad iuvandos amicos?*—IV. Εὐκλῆς. An Oscan inscription found near Agnone gives the names of the divinities to whom the altars and statues in the sacred enclosure of Ceres are consecrated as follows (the names being in the dative case): *Veskei, Evkloi, Kerri*. The second name corresponds naturally to the Greek Εὐκλῆς (Εὐκλος). Hesychius has this gloss: *εὐκλῆς· ὁ φθῆς καὶ ὀνομαστός καὶ εὐειδής*, in which there is nothing wrong but an accent. Further, Fiorelli has recently published (Notizie degli Scavi, 1880, April, p. 155) the inscriptions upon certain gold plates found in the tombs at Sybaris. One of these inscriptions has the lines:

*έρχομαι ἐκ καθαρῶν καθάρᾳ, χθονίων βασιλεια,  
Εὐκλῆς Εὐβουλείς τε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,  
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμῶν γένος, ὀλβιοι, εὐχομαι εἶναι.*

The form *Evkloi* is to be translated into Latin *Orco*.—V. Ennius et Gniphio. M. Antonius Gniphio, the teacher of Julius Caesar, was the author of a commentary on the Annals of Ennius.—VI. Explanatory notes on the anonymous poem addressed to C. Calpurnius Piso.—VII. Propert. V 11, 72, B. proposes to write *libera fama ingrum*.—VIII. Antipatri Tyrii. Fiorelli has published (Notizie degli Scavi, 1880, July, p. 250) the inscription upon the tomb of *Philon Antas Antipatri Tyri filius*, who was buried at Brundisium. There is reason for

thinking this Philo the son of that Antipater Tyrius who held the first rank among Stoic philosophers in Cicero's time. That Philo was a merchant and a traveller may be inferred from an existing epigram (Kaibel, 779), found upon a votive tablet near Constantinople, in which the sentence ὡς τὸν εὐάντητον ἀεὶ θεὸν Ἀντιπάτρου παῖς στήσε φίλων seems to contain a word-play upon the name Antas. The whole epigram is well written. Further, the man known always to Cicero by the name Antipater Sidonius was a facile versifier and a Stoic not without learning in philosophy. And we learn from a direct statement of Meleager (Anth. Pal. VII 428, 14) that he was born at Tyre. In spite of the commonness of the name Antipater, it seems safe to infer that this earlier Antipater was of the same stock from which the distinguished philosopher and the poetical merchant descended.—IX. Anglosaxonum Latina aenigmata.

2. Pp. 343–50. H. Diels. Stobaeus and Aëtius. Remarks on various matters treated in the *Doxographi Graeci*, for which Elter's dissertation (De Ioannis Stobaei Codice Photiano, Bonn, 1880) affords new points of view.

3. Pp. 351–61. L. Jeep. The Lacunae in the Chronicle of Malalas.

4. Pp. 362–79. M. Schanz. The Writings of Cornelius Celsus. An attempt to find out precisely what may be *known* of the subject, apart from uncertain conjectures. The several paragraphs of the paper may be summarized as follows: 1. The treatise on medicine must have been written later than B. C. 23. This is proved by an allusion to the cure of Augustus by cold water under the treatment of Antonius Musa (Cels. 3, 9). It must have been written earlier than A. D. 48, because Celsus (4, 7) says *quamvis in monumentis medicorum non legerim* of a recipe found in the work of Scribonius Largus, who published his collection not later than A. D. 48. 2. Graecinus, the father of Agricola, wrote a book on the care of vineyards, in which he followed Celsus (Plin. H. U. 14, 33). Graecinus died A. D. 38. Therefore, the *De Re Rustica* of Celsus was published before A. D. 38. 3. The *De Re Rustica* was written earlier than *De Medicina*, as appears from references made in the later treatise. These two works were published together in the order of composition. The inference to this effect from the headings in the MSS is supported by the fact that the opening words of the *De Medicina*, *ut alimenta sanis corporibus agricultura, sic sanitatem aegris medicina promittit*, show the author's usual formula for transition from one subject to another. 4. It is certain that Celsus wrote upon agriculture, medicine, the art of war, rhetoric, and philosophy, and almost certain that he wrote upon law. 5. It is probable that Celsus wrote only one work on philosophy. The statements of Quintilian (X 1, 124; XII 11, 24) support no other inference; and Augustine, in the preface to his *De Haeresibus*, speaks in a way to make it plain that the Celsus whom he mentions wrote of heresies of later origin than the Christian religion. 6. The *De Medicina* suffices to prove the author's habit of referring to his own previous work. But it contains no references to any of the author's *Artes* except the *De Re Rustica*. It follows that the others were published later. The arrangement of the six *Artes* was probably this: *De Re Rustica*, *De Medicina*, *De Re Militari*, *De Rhetorica*, *De Philosophia*, *De Iure Civili*. 7. The title was *Artes*, in spite of the scholion published by Ritschl (Praef. ad Plaut. Bacch. VI). 8. The *De Philosophia* followed the teaching of the Sextii. It is therefore impossible (Sen. Quaest. Nat. 7, 32, 2) to set its date much later than the death of Tiberius (A. D. 37). Connecting



this date with those previously given, we may say that the encyclopaedia of Celsus was published not much later than the death of Tiberius. 9. It is certain that the monograph on War with the Parthians was not written before A. D. 53, and at least possible that it was written by Marcus Celsus, a Roman general who took part in the Parthian war in the year 63. 10. Columella mentions Celsus as a man of the past (3, 17, 4; 2, 2, 14), and Seneca as a man of the present (3, 3, 3). Therefore Celsus must have died before Seneca (A. D. 65).

5. Pp. 330-434. E. Rohde. Studies in the Chronology of Greek Literature. The first instalment—for no more is given in this number—discusses the various reasonings and computations which guided Greek chronologers in fixing the date of Homer.

6. Pp. 435-62. F. Hettner. The Discoveries at Neumagen, with a plate of illustrations. In the course of certain excavations at Neumagen on the Mosel, in the year 1878, very extensive remains of Roman sepulchres were brought to light—stones which had been removed from their original places and built into the foundations of mediaeval structures. The inscriptions and sculptures on these stones, and the remains of decorative color as well, are remarkably fresh and well preserved, but the restoration of the original architectural forms is difficult. H. attempts only a preliminary account of the monuments, not a final and complete description. The scenes represented in the sculptures are taken from common life, and show a great variety of occupations, utensils, forms of dress, and the like, in gratifying detail.

7. Pp. 463-80. Miscellany. W. Dittenberger gives a corrected restoration of a metrical inscription published in the Bull. de Corr. Hell. 1880, p. 130, as follows:

Ἀγαθῇ τ[ύχη]  
Ἡρωδιανὸς Νει(κί)ου πα(τ)ρὸς (σ)τήσεν  
Χάλκειον ἀνδριάντα πατρίδος ψήφῳ,  
γνώμης τε ἑκατι, μείλιχος γὰρ ἦν πᾶσιν,  
τερπνῶν τε με(ί)μων οὓς ἐγραψεν ἀστεΐως.

He adds, by way of joke, this note of the original editor: "celle-ci paraît écrite en trimètres iambiques; mais la règle fondamentale de ce mètre est violée à chaque vers, puisqu' on y trouve régulièrement un spondée ou un trochée au sixième pied."

F. Böheler repeats an epitaph on another author of Mimes from the Revue Archeologique, 1881, p. 124.

W. Hoerschelmann gives a note on the commentary to the *ἐγχειρίδιον* of Hephaestion. He there finds Alcaeus Fr. 5 in this form: *χαῖρε κυλλάνας ὁ κούων, σὲ γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ὑμνεῖν. τὸν κορυφᾶσιν αὐγαῖς μαία γέννα τῷ κρονίδῃ μαυία μαυρίσσειλε.*

A. Ludwig gives critical notes on the Bibliotheca of Apollodorus.

H. Heydemann contributes several remarks on the interpretation of inscriptions on Greek vases.

A. Philippi objects to Büdinger's method (Berichte d. Wiener Akad. 92, 1877 ff.) in trying to restore the story of Solon and Croesus to its old place in history.

A. Riese compares Anth. Lat. 901 with Serv. ad. Verg. Aen. VI 724 by way of showing that the former was not the production of a scholar of the Renaissance.

G. Voigt has collected a number of notices which warrant the hope that material for the restoration of the text of Cicero's letters *ad Familiares* may be found in France.

M. Voigt writes *aprici mergi* for *apris mergis* in the second glossary of Salerno. The explanation would then be intended for Verg. Aen. V 128.

F. Bücheler writes of Petronius at the Hanoverian court in the year 1702. Leibnitz, in a letter to Princess Louise of Hohenzollern, dated at Hanover, 25 Feb. 1702, gave a minute description of the amusements of the carnival, which closed with a burlesque somewhat freely imitated from Petronius. The note with which B. concludes will not seem to readers of this Journal too long for reproduction here. It is as follows: "Wenn dem geehrten Leser diese Mittheilung aus vergangenen Zeiten angenehm oder nützlich scheint, so möge er zugleich erfahren, dass die Anregung dazu von einem Manne kam, den Belesenheit, Geist und Geschmack zu einem Urtheil über philologische Fragen wie kaum einen anderen befähigten, der abgesehen von dem Ehrenplatz, den er in der Geschichte unsrer Wissenschaft behaupten wird, um diese Zeitschrift besonders grosse Verdienste sich erworben hat, nicht allein durch die in derselben gedruckten Beiträge, gehaltreiche eindringliche anziehende Abhandlungen vornehmlich aus früheren Jahren, und feine treffende Monita die er gerne ohne seinen Namen ausgehen liess, sondern durch seine hervorragende Betheiligung an der Redaction, von der auch der Titel mehrerer Bände des Museums Zeugniß ablegt, mit und neben Ritschl und Welcker, und durch seine stäte Fürsorge für das wissenschaftliche Gedeihen des von ihm miterzogenen Kindes, die sich bis in seine letzten Tage durch wohl bedachte Rathschläge und wohlwollende Censur zu erkennen gab. Jacob Bernays starb am 26 Mai [1881], keine sechzig alt, ganz unerwartet, wenn auch zwischen Leben und Tod mehrere Tage der Bewusstlosigkeit und Auflösung lagen, kaum hatte er für seinen 'Phokion,' mit dem er eben die Freunde beschenkt, noch ein Wort des Danks entgegen nehmen können. Nicht mit allen Wegen und Mitteln der heutigen Philologie war er einverstanden, von den letzten Decennien lenkte er den Blick lieber zurück zu der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts, zu Herren wie Scaliger und Casaubonus, seine Aeusserungen über die junge Sprachwissenschaft und einige andere Theile des Gebiets das uns beiden angelegen war und das er in peripatetischen Gesprächen zu behandeln liebte, entsprachen nicht den jetzt giltigen oder meinen Anschauungen; aber ein grosser Kenner und ein Kenner des Grossen, getränkt aus den edelsten Quellen des Alterthums, bewandert in der Literatur moderner Völker, gewaltig unter den Mitforschenden und ein würdevoller Tyrann der 'Mitredenden' von sehr weitem und sehr scharfem Blick, weise und gerecht und frei von vielen Banden, mit welchen äusseres Leben oder eigene Gelüste bestricken und das Urtheil der Machthaber auch in wissenschaftlichen Dingen gefangen nehmen, wog dieser Eine mehr als Hunderte. οἱκοι μένειν δεῖ τὸν καλῶς εὐδαίμονα pflegte er zu citiren. Haus und Universität waren ihm Eins fast ihm strengsten Wortsinne, das Weichbild Bonns hatte er seit 10 Jahren nicht verlassen (letztmals zu einem Besuch von Johannes Brandis in dessen nahe gelegener Villa am Rhein); der Einsamkeit

ergeben, las und bedachte er unendlich viel, sinnend und rathend über Politik und Judenthum, Philosophie und gelehrte Welt, den Geist spannend ohne Nachlass bis das Hirn tödtlich geschlagen ward. Ein gut Theil seiner Oikonomia betraf dies Museum, so stehe denn hier auch dies Gedenkzeichen für ihn in Dankbarkeit und Wehmuth gesetzt von einem Schüler, Collegen und Freunde."

## XXXVI 4.

1. Pp. 481-9. H. Osthoff. Notes on the Inscription of Dvenos (see R. M. XXXVI 235). O. regards *Ioue Sat deivos* as accusatives of the *end of motion*. The following words he writes *neited endo cosmis vir cosied asted*. He then translates: "Whosoever shall offer me to the gods Jupiter and Saturn, let him take pains that a helpful man be with him and by him within, unless he wishes the offering of prayer to be brought to Ops Toitesia." It is not safe to identify *cosmis* with *cōmes*; rather we have here a confirmation of the view which connects *cōmis* with *commodus*. The form *vois* (*vis*) cannot be derived from the root *vel*: a parallel root *vi*, to which other indications point, must be assumed.

2. Pp. 490-505. P. Egenolff. In *Herodianum Technicum Critica*. A continuation of the collations begun in the previous volume (XXXV 98 ff. and 504 ff.)

3. Pp. 506-23. P. Corssen. The Sources of Cic. Tusc. I. In his dissertation *De Posidonio Rhodio* (Bonn, 1878), C. attempted to show that Cicero in the first part of Tusc. I followed his contemporary Posidonius of Rhodes. He now extends the scope of his reasoning. The two parts of Tusc. I, in spite of the contradictions between them, come from one and the same source. But the recognition of this fact makes the contradictions themselves all the more striking. Cic. himself obviously wished the two parts to be regarded as independent and treated them accordingly. The whole arrangement is his own. But he found the substance of his material in some one work of an earlier author, and sought only to abbreviate what he borrowed and to state it from points of view largely of his own selection. The work thus used by Cicero we may fairly assume to have been of a popular rather than of a strictly scientific character: taking subject and treatment together, we may refer it to the class of *λόγοι παραμυθητικοί* of which Krantor seems to have been the inventor. Such a conjecture is strongly confirmed by a comparison of Cic. Tusc. I with Plutarch Cons. ad Apollonium. The fact that both writers had drawn material from a common source was remarked long ago; but C. points out for the first time that passages confirming this view are to be found in the *first part* of Tusc. I. If the views stated in C.'s earlier dissertation are adopted, we need not inquire further after the author followed by Cicero and Plutarch. But it has been generally assumed that Plutarch followed Krantor directly. C. therefore proceeds to show that this view is untenable; that the work used, although it made use of Krantor's material, was composed after Krantor's death. The article is a fine specimen of the better sort of "Quellenuntersuchungen."

4. Pp. 524-75. E. Rohde. Studies in the Chronology of Greek literature. Continuation of the investigations touching the date of Homer, begun at p. 380.

5. Pp. 576-96. W. Deecke. Notes on the Interpretation of the Messapian Inscriptions. "Fassen wir die bisherigen Resultate zusammen, so kann das Messapische fast eine altgriechische, wenn man will pelasgische Sprache genannt werden, wie der altepirotische Zeus von Dodona bei Homer der 'pelasgische' heisst. Es giebt demgemäss vielfältige wichtige und interessante Aufschlüsse über die griechische Lautlehre, Flexion und Etymologie."

6. Pp. 597-603. C. Wachsmuth. 'Ο ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ ἀγών. The lines Ar. Ach. 502-507 have very little of the Aristophanic flavor. It is generally agreed that the piece is not free from interpolations. Definite objections to the lines in question are the following: 1. The connection of clauses in 504, indeed throughout the lines 504-506, is extremely awkward. 2. Unlike Aristophanes but very like an interpolator is the repetition of αὐτοὶ γάρ ἐσμεν (504), in ἀλλ' ἐσμεν αὐτοί (507). 3. ἐκ τῶν πόλεων οἱ ξύμμαχοι (506) is pleonastic. At that day in Athens αἱ πόλεις alone sufficed to designate the confederacy; a genuine way of saying what is here meant may be seen in 636. 5. The explanation given in 505-506 for the statement κοῦπω ξένοι πάρεσιν is simply silly. And finally, it is incredible that the poet—for this is his explanation with the audience—should have gone to work to make it so very clear to them that the present was not the time of year for the visit of the ambassadors—as if any Athenian had been stupid enough not to know that! In short, of what we have in 504-507, Aristophanes wrote only αὐτοὶ γάρ ἐσμεν νῦν γε περιεπτισμένοι. Having laid this foundation, W. goes on to show that ὁ ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ ἀγών is not an Attic name for the competition which the interpolator meant to designate. We find τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐν τοῖς Ἀθηναϊκοῖς ἀγῶσι. But we do not find the ἀγῶνες nor the χοροί nor the διδασκαλῖαι nor the νικαὶ called ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ. This can only be used with propriety to mark the locality of the thing designated. In that sense we find the official name Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ (from which the interpolator borrowed in fashioning his line), and ἡ ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ πομπή. In our passage such a designation of the locality would have no sense, for at that period all the dramatic celebrations took place in the one Dionysiac theatre. In Plat. Protag. 327 D. ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ means nothing more than "in the theatre," the preceding πέρυσι is quite enough to show that ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίῳ is not used to distinguish one festival from another.

7. Pp. 604-40. Miscellany. F. Blass fills a dozen pages with notes on Greek inscriptions. These have to do mostly with the explanation of Boeotian and Doric forms, and do not admit of the compression necessary in these reports. A couple of remarks on Attic inscriptions may be reproduced. CIA. I 342 (CIG. I 27) concludes: Δήμητρος τε χάριν [καί] θυγατέρος [τ]ανυπέπλου. G. Meyer (Gr. Gr. §111) makes two mistakes worthy of correction. The form γένητε, which he cites as the earliest Attic example of ε for αι, is not to be found in the inscription in question (CIA. II 379, 18): the genuine reading is ὅπως γένητ' ἐφρόντιω[εν]. And αἰμάτιον for εἰμάτιον is nothing but a misprint copied out of Cauer. "Doch wäre es ungerecht, nicht anzuerkennen, dass die bei Cauer stehen gebliebenen Druckfehler weder seine zahlreichsten, noch seine unverzeihlichsten Sünden sind."

H. Heydemann continues the notes to inscriptions on Greek vases begun at p. 465.

F. Bücheler explains the inscriptions from Olympia, Nos. 382 and 383.

A. Ludwich writes Theocr. I 135-6: καὶ τὼς κίνας ὠλαφος ἔλαοι ἐξ ὀρέων, χοὶ σκῶπερ ἀηδόσι δηρίσαιντο, a correction which can hardly fail to find favor.

H. Flach examines the biographical notices in Suidas which show a use of the Greek translation of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* made by Sophronius.

S. Brandt offers six emendations to passages in Cicero's Letters to Atticus.

F. v. Duhn returns to the Harbor of Pompeii (see R. M. XXXV 127 ff.) Stricter investigation of the circumstances of the discovery of the articles found near the Molini de Rosa affords still clearer evidence that the mouth of the Sarnus and the docks of Pompeii were at that place. The space between the town and its harbor was occupied by a suburb.

J. Klein fills up the lacunæ in a recently discovered Roman inscription containing the name of the *curator locorum publicorum* P. Catius Sabinus, and gives a list of such *curatores*, so far as known, from Augustus to Diocletian.

J. H. WHEELER.

ANGLIA. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. Bände V und VI, 1 u. 2 Hefte. Halle, 1882-83.

B. ten Brink begins volume V with brief remarks on the quantity of the first *e* in the O. E. (*i. e.* A. S.) suffix *-ere*, and concludes from O. E. verse, M. E. accent, and M. E. rime, that it is long.

G. Schleich furnishes some corrections to Varnhagen's text of the Proverbs of Hendyng, from the Cambridge and Oxford MSS, given in Anglia IV 180.

Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith prints, for the first time, the text of a ballad by Thomas Occleve, addressed to Sir John Oldcastle, A. D. 1415, from Phillipps MS 8151, with an introduction, giving some account of Oldcastle and Occleve, and notes. Occleve appeals to Oldcastle "to renounce his opinions as a follower of Wiclif, warning him of his errors and of his danger."

A. Fritzsche discusses the question: Is the O. E. [M. E.] story of Genesis and Exodus the work of one author? ten Brink, who first called attention to the source of this thirteenth century poem, namely, the *Historia Scholastica* of the French priest Petrus Comestor (1169-75), suggested the possibility of two authors. Fritzsche makes a careful study of the poem, based on Dr. Morris's edition for the E. E. T. Society, and concludes (p. 84), from the use of the same source in the same way, the same versification in respect to metre, rime and alliteration, and the same language in respect to phonology, grammar (referring to Morris and Hilmer), syntax and vocabulary, that there is but *one* author. He adds critical notes, agreeing in great part with Kölbing *Englische Studien*, III 273-334.

E. Einenkel discusses the question: Is the late Anglo-Saxon [thirteenth century] legend of St. Katharine of Alexandria a work of the author of St. Juliana and St. Margaret, or of the author of *Hali Meidenhad*? This essay is the third part of the author's work, *Ueber die Verfasser einiger neuangels. Schriften*, Leipzig, 1881, in which he has shown that St. Juliana and St. Margaret are the work of the same author. He now compares the words and phrases, verse and style of St. Katharine with each of the above-mentioned works, and concludes that St. Katharine is *not* by the same author as the other two legends,

but that the latter writer knew and used the legend of St. Katharine. The second question is more difficult, but cannot be answered affirmatively; hence, the homily Hali Meidenhad is by a third hand and later than the others, or, at least, than St. Margaret.

A. Ebert, in the studies for his History of Mediaeval Literature, has compared the Anglo-Saxon Genesis with the Vulgate, and communicates the additions and omissions which he has noticed from v. 852 to end. He concludes that this part of the Genesis cannot be by Caedmon, for the writer evidently had the Bible *before his eyes*, which does not correspond with what Beda says about Caedmon, and, moreover, the *carmina* mentioned by Beda were lyrical poems, hymns, and so of a different kind from the Genesis.

K. J. Schröder suggests two very plausible emendations to the text of Marlowe's Faustus; the Latin words '*quod tumeraris*' should be '*quid tu moraris?*'; and '*ignei, aëri, aquitani spiritus*' should be '*ignis, aëris, aquae, terrae spiritus!*' Goethe's text confirms these.

A. Schröder prints the full text of John Bale's Comedy Concernynge Thre Lawes, Anno MDXXXVIII, preceded by an introduction giving a full account of Bale and his works, and followed by notes on certain words and an excursus on the metre. This miracle play has in the colophon "lately inprinted per Nicolaum Bamburgensem," of whom Schröder knows nothing, but thinks the play was printed in Germany. Only three copies remain, two in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, one of them incomplete, and one in the British Museum. Hazlitt mentions a second imprint at London, 1562, but no copy of this is in London or Oxford. So far as known, the play has not been printed since.

E. Eikenkel, in his essay on An English Authoress of the beginning of the 12th [13th, Anz. 64] century, labors to prove that the Wohunge of ure Louerd, the Ureisun of God Almihti, and the Lofsong of ure Louerde, are written by women, i. e. nuns, and that it is not improbable that our authoress is identical with one of the three maidens of the Ancren Riwe. He thinks that he has proved the first position, and that a great deal may be said for the second. The investigation seems to proceed from this comprehensive premise (p. 265): "Das geschlecht des verfassers aller dieser liebeschriften ergibt sich deshalb ganz von selbst aus dem gegenstande desselben," i. e. if the work praises the Virgin Mary, it must be written by a man; if Christ, by a woman. Once granted, this would settle the question, but, notwithstanding the "liebeskultus," it may be doubted whether the monks resigned to the nuns the privilege of writing all Lofsonges of ure Louerde, and the Scotch verdict may apply to all such investigations.

D. Rohde writes an appreciative notice of W. Hertzberg, well known as an English scholar, and especially for his services to the study of Chaucer and Shakspeare. He died July 7, 1879. His life was marked by great literary activity. A complete list of his works closes the notice, which ends the first number of this volume.

A. Schröder opens the second number with a republication of the text of 'The Grave' from the MS (Bodl. 343), correcting some errors in Thorpe's text.

O. Lohmann contributes a critical essay on Byron's *Manfred* and its relation to poems of like contents, *i. e.* to the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, *Don Juan* of Molière, and *Faust* of Goethe. Goethe and Byron have transferred much of their own personality to the characters of their heroes; Molière and Aeschylus stand apart from their works. Shelley's *Prometheus* might have been advantageously included in the comparison.

M. Bech examines the Sources and Plan of the *Legende of Goode Women* and its relation to the 'Confessio Amantis.' The sources have already been noticed by ten Brink, Sandras, Bartsch, and Hertzberg, but in no case exhaustively. Besides the *Confessio Amantis*, Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium* and *De mulieribus claris* liber are taken into consideration. Lack of space forbids following the investigation, but after a full discussion of the Sources and a brief comparison with Gower, the general result in respect to the Plan is summed up, that, as the *Decamerone* was the model for the *Canterbury Tales*, so the *De mulieribus claris* liber was the model for the *Legende of Goode Women*, which, however, was never finished.

W. Sattler continues his *Contributions on the use of Prepositions in Modern English*, with XV, *to die of, to die from*; XVI, *the key of, the key to*; XVII, *kind of him, kind in him*; XVIII, *in a loud voice, with a (loud) voice*, forming a very full collection of examples.

A. Ebert on the *Exodus* (Anglo-Saxon), briefly states his reasons for regarding the so-called episode, 362-445, as an integral part of the poem and no interpolation, as recently treated in the Bonn dissertation of H. Balg on *The Poet Caedmon and his Works*.

K. A. M. Hartmann discusses the question: Is King Alfred the author of the alliterating version of the *Metres of Boethius*? He enumerates the opinions of scholars from Rawlinson (1698) down, showing that no one doubted the Alfredian authorship before Wright (1842), whose arguments are briefly stated, namely, that the writer omits to versify three metres, because they are not introduced by the usual formula in King Alfred's prose version; that the metres are very weak, considered from a poetical standpoint; and that the author has a very deficient knowledge of classical antiquity, and commits errors where Alfred's prose has the correct translation. Hartmann combats each of these arguments, defends the Alfredian authorship of the Preface, which ten Brink had questioned, though he favored the authenticity of the metres, adds arguments drawn from the use of certain expressions and particular words, and concludes that Wright's arguments are "pseudo-arguments," and that "King Alfred and nobody else is the author."

R. P. Wülcker, *On the Vercelli-Book*, states the results of his own examination of the MS, giving the beginning and the end of each of the homilies contained in it, the thirteenth complete, and extracts from the *Life of St. Guthlac* compared with Goodwin's text from Cotton MS, Vesp. D XXI.

Wülcker prefixes an account of Blume's discovery, made in 1822, that the MS was written in Anglo-Saxon, the subsequent references to it, the first publication of the poetry by Thorpe, from a copy of the MS made by Blume, in Appendix B to Cooper's *Report on Rymer's Foedera*, made for the Record Commission (1836), Grimm's *Andreas and Elene* (1840), from Cooper, Kemble's



edition of the Poetry, with translation, for the Aelfric Society (1844-46), and Zupitza's edition of the *Elene* (1877) after a new collation made by Knöll. The Homilies of the Vercelli-Book have never been published.

T. Wissmann, in the last essay, *On Middle-English Word-Accent*, supports the views expressed in his *King Horn* against those of Schipper in his *Old-English Metre*. He examines the verse of the *Ormulum* and the *Poema Morale*, and argues that the 'senkungen' and the 'tonlose' and 'stumme silben' are treated in exact accordance with Lachmann's rules for M. H. G. metre, and in direct opposition to Schipper's view (p. 476). He further examines again certain verses in *King Horn*, and claims that they correspond to the rules heretofore laid down. He argues, too, against Vetter's view of Anglo-Saxon metre (supported by Schipper), and contends that by the acceptance of the 'zweihebungstheorie' all intelligible rhythm is lost and the absolute formlessness of Germanic metre is established (p. 481).

The controversy is continued in the *Anzeiger* by Einkenkel, in a review of Schipper's work, by Schipper in reply, and by Trautmann. T. grants the 'zweihebungstheorie' for Anglo-Saxon verse, but his views on the metre of Layamon are similar to those of Wissmann on that of *King Horn*, and so are opposed to Schipper's. It would prolong this report to unreasonable length to go into the controversy, even to give an outline of these lengthy articles, but to an ordinary English ear, Schipper's view seems the more suitable to English verse. Wissmann's implied reproach to the 'zweihebungstheoretiker' [he inadvertently writes *vier*-], namely, "Zwei gehobene silben in jeder halbzeile das ist so ziemlich das einzige [rather hauptsächliche] erfoderniss das sie an den rhythmus der [des] verses stellen" (p. 481), appears to be justified by the structure of Anglo-Saxon verse, and if so, historical consistency would lead us to expect it in the verse of Layamon and other Middle-English writers, and not to assume these works to be written on a different principle, however applicable that principle may be to Old and Middle High German verse. Also, there seems no good reason for assuming the final *e* in *lære* to be 'tonlos' but 'tonfähig,' while that of *spēke* is 'stumm,' and so 'tonunfähig,' according to Wissmann's terminology. The question here is not one of *quantity* of the root-syllable, but of *accent*, and so far from regarding "Schipper's versuch, die absolute tonunfähigkeit aller silben mit unbetontem *e* zu erweisen, als vollständig misglückt" (p. 476), I should take it as a simple statement of fact existing in English verse (cf. Schipper, section III, chapter 6, §§60-3).

Wissmann gives as Appendix a carefully prepared synopsis of the metre of eighteen M. E. works, illustrating the view which he is defending.

R. P. Wülcker contributes a short obituary notice of L. Botkine, the young French scholar, known from his translation of "*Beowulf*" and the *Rune-Song*, who died in May, 1882, at the early age of twenty-nine. We can sympathize with Wülcker's ejaculation: "Leider, wurde B. zu früh seiner wissenschaft entrissen und wer weiss wann wider jemand für verbreitung des Angelsächsischen in Frankreich wirken wird!" French students of Anglo-Saxon have been all too few, and may be counted on the fingers of one hand.

K. Elze adds an 'Entgegnung,' taking exception to certain remarks of Dr. Leo, in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, which, however, seem quite complimentary.



It must suffice to add merely a summary of the contents of the *Anzeiger* to this volume. W. Muschacke reviews A. Brandl's *Thomas of Erceldoune*; F. Dönne, G. Lüdtcke's *The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn*; both of these works appear in the *Weidmannsche Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben*. G. Tanger replies to Furnivall's remarks on his edition of the First and Second Quartos, and the First Folio of *Hamlet: Their Relation to Each Other*, reprinted from the *New Shakspeare Society's Transactions*, 1880-82; E. Einenkel reviews O. Zielke's *Sir Orfeo, ein englisches Feenmärchen aus dem Mittelalter*; A. Brandl, R. H. Hutton's *Sir Walter Scott*, in *English Men of Letters Series*; M. Trautmann, C. Horstmann's *Altenglische Legenden*; Miss L. T. Smith, the *Catholicon Anglicum*, edited by S. J. Herrtage for the E. E. T. Society, 1881: this is an English-Latin word-book, dated 1483, and heretofore known in only two MSS; it contains about 8000 words, each provided by the editor with passages illustrative of its use; we find, *e. g.*, "*Loye*: elegius, nomen proprium," and notes to it, which, as Miss Smith remarks, settle the question as to the Prioress's oath.<sup>1</sup> (See A. J. P., II 386.) E. Einenkel reviews at length (23 pages) Schipper's *Englische Metrik*, and later (*Anz.* 139) adds a continuation (5 pages) of this review; and M. Trautmann closes the first part of the *Anzeiger* with a review of D. Asher's pamphlet, *Ueber den Unterricht in den Neuern Sprachen, spezieller der Englischen, an unseren Universitäten und höheren Schulen*, and of G. Körting's *Gedanken und Bemerkungen über das Studium der Neuern Sprachen auf den Deutschen Hochschulen*, which review contains some valuable suggestions.

G. Schleich begins the second part with a review of *The Romaunce of the Sowdone of Babylone* and of *Ferumbras his Sone who conquerede Rome*, re-edited by E. Hausknecht for the E. E. T. Society, 1881; R. P. Wülcker reviews the *Toller-Bosworth Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, Parts I and II, and A. Napier's *Göttingen Inaugural-dissertation, Ueber die Werke des altenglischen erzbischofs Wulfstan*; R. Boyle, on A. H. Bullen's *Old Plays*, announces the completion of the reissue of *Day's Plays*, and asks for subscribers to four volumes of old dramas soon to be published by Mr. Bullen (Vol. I now ready), at one guinea per volume.

F. Kluge reviews Sievers's *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, the latest and best Anglo-Saxon grammar that we have; and W. Merkes, E. Einenkel's work, *Ueber die Verfasser einiger neuangelsächsischer Schriften, i. e., St. Juliana, St. Margaret, and Hali Meidenhad*. (See above.)

Schipper, *Zur altenglischen Wortbetonung, eine Entgegnung*, follows, in which reply he sustains well his previously expressed views against his opponents, Wissmann in particular, rejecting *in toto* Lachmann's rules as inapplicable to English verse; Trautmann, *Zur alt- und mittelenglischen Verslehre*, combats Schipper, but, while accepting Lachmann's *versregeln*, *i. e.*, adhering to the 'Vierhebungstheorie' for Layamon's verse, he rejects Lachmann's *betonungsgesetze*, and presents other rules of accent much more elastic, though still at variance with Schipper. He also takes exception to the measure assigned by Schipper to some other Middle-English poems. J. Koch reviews W. Eiler's

<sup>1</sup> On the deficiencies of Herrtage's ed. of the *Catholicon Anglicum*, see J. H. Hessels, in *Academy*, No. 586, for July 28, 1883.

Die Erzählung des Pfarrers in Chaucer's Canterbury-geschichten und die *Somme de Vices et de Vertus des Frère Lorens*, an Erlangen dissertation, and Zupitza's edition of Chaucer's Prolog. Einkenkel completes his review of Schipper, and Trautmann finishes the *Anzeiger*, and the volume, with a notice of the *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für Deutsche Philologie in Berlin, dritter Jahrgang, 1881—a most useful work.

## VI 1.

B. Leonhardt begins the sixth volume of the *ANGLIA* with an article on the Sources of *Cymbeline*. Besides the acknowledged sources of Shakspeare's play, namely, Holinshed's *Chronicle* and Boccaccio's *Decameron* II 9, the following have been regarded by some critics as sources of the play: 1. An English story, 'The Tale told by the Fishwife of Standon-the-Green' [? Stand-on], found in *Westward for Smelts*, a book published in 1619; 2. Two Old-French romances, belonging probably to the first half of the thirteenth century; 3. An Old-French miracle-play; and 4. The German tale of *Sneewitchen*, compared with *Cymbeline* by K. Schenkl in *Germania* IV. After a detailed examination of each of these the writer concludes that there is no reason for thinking that Shakspeare used any one of them, that Holinshed and Boccaccio were his only sources, the latter most probably in an English translation, although the earliest translation of the whole *Decameron* was not published until 1620,<sup>1</sup> and that the union of the two stories in the drama is entirely his own work.

P. Lange discusses Chaucer's Influence on Douglas. He compares at length Douglas's *Palice of Honour* with Chaucer's *House of Fame* and Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, and concludes that traces of this influence are plainly seen. Lange includes in his comparison some of the spurious poems, but, while this may show Douglas's acquaintance with these poems, it does not add any weight to the argument for *Chaucer's* influence. He notices also the sources of the *Palice of Honour*, and shows that the direct source is not the *Tabula of Kebes*, as thought by Warton, Irving, and Bishop Sage, the biographer of Douglas, but *Le Séjour d'Honneur*, by Octavien de St. Gelais, Bishop of Angoulême (1466–1502). Douglas's *King Hart* and *Translation of Vergil* are more briefly compared with Chaucer, and the conclusion drawn that in all his poems Douglas shows the influence of Chaucer.

E. Hausknecht contributes Old-English Glosses on the Brussels MS (No. 1650) of Aldhelm's *De Laudibus Virginitatis*. These have been already published by Mone (*Quellen und Forschungen*, 1830), and by Bouterwek (*Haupt's Zeitschrift* IX), but with some errors in both publications.

J. Koch supplies Chauceriana. I. 'Mother of God,' to the authorship of which he thinks Occleve has greater claims than Chaucer; and II. *Canterbury Tales*, Prologue 459–60, quoting a passage from *Jobi Ludolfi alias Leutholf dicti ad suam Historiam Aethiopicam Commentarius* (Frankfort, 1691): 'De

<sup>1</sup> Perry, *English Literature in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 287, note, states that "many of his stories—*Bandello's* and *Cinthio's*—had been translated in William Paynter's '*Palace of Pleasure*' (1566)."

copulatione conjugum ante fores templi,' etc., which throws light upon the Wife of Bath's statement, 'Housbondes atte chirch dore I have had fyve.'

E. Uhlemann compares Chaucer's House of Fame and Pope's Temple of Fame, that is, those parts of the third book of Chaucer's poem which Pope has professedly followed. Uhlemann finds that Pope has completely changed many parts of his model, having taken only the leading thoughts from Chaucer's poem, and having worked the descriptive details to correspond to the taste of his time; also, that Pope's style and metre differ greatly from Chaucer's. He thus confirms, in general, Pope's own statement of his indebtedness to Chaucer, but agrees rather with Warton than with Steele in his estimate of the poem; the latter says: "the original vision of Chaucer was never denied to be much improved"; the former, "He (Pope) has not only misrepresented the story, but marred the character of the poem."

A. Leicht, in reply to Hartmann (*Anglia* V 411), discusses the question: Is King Alfred the author of the alliterating metres of Boethius? He finds that this is but an indifferent paraphrase of King Alfred's prose version, padded out with stereotype poetical expressions drawn from the ancient epic poetry and inserted in a tasteless manner, and that the writer has occasionally misunderstood his prose model, especially two passages in Metre 26, IV 3, in one of which the prose version speaks of Ulysses as King of Ithaca (*Iþacige*), and for this the poetical version substitutes *Dracia*. Moreover, this version is pervaded not by a poetical, but by a pedantic spirit, and does not observe the laws of alliteration as seen in the older poetry. Therefore also, Alfred is not the author of the preface and introduction, but these are written by the poetical paraphrast, most probably a monk who desired to shield his unskilful work under Alfred's great name. Leicht thus controverts the view of Rawlinson, Cardale, Fox, Tupper [!], and even ten Brink, and agrees with Wright, who (as stated above) first attacked the Alfredian authorship of the alliterating metres, though he takes exception to some of Wright's arguments. It is some consolation to have King Alfred relieved of the reputation of being a bad poet. Leicht will have another article in a future number on the prose Preface and the relation of the prose version to the Latin.

J. Platt contributes *Angelsacchisches*, as follows: 1. A. S. genders, a list of words of different genders in older and later works. 2. Local names of the *bôc*-declension, *Cent*, *Cert*, *I'*, *Tenet*, *Wiht*. 3. A true A. S. dual, *i. e. sculdru* [?]. 4. A. S. *u* in feminine of the *n*-declension. 5. A. S. feminine *wd*-stems, *mded*, *ldes*. 6. A. S. *fetian*, *feccan*. 7. A. S. feminine termination *-icge*. Some of Mr. Platt's statements, especially under 2 and 3, might provoke discussion, and with regard to his assertion under 6: "So sprechen wir im engl. *Tuesday* nicht *tjûz* sondern *chûz* aus," I have only to say that, if this is the prevalent "London" pronunciation, it is but another proof that the correct pronunciation of English is better preserved on this side of the water.

C. Weiser furnishes an unpublished letter of Shelley's, of Nov. 22, 1817, sent him by Mr. R. Garnett, the editor of Shelley's letters. It is of interest only as showing Shelley's opinion of his "Queen Mab," and his professed determination to devote his life to inculcating "the doctrine of equality and liberty and disinterestedness, and entire unbelief in religion of any sort." The

letter was found in the library of Lord Lytton, and was sent to Weiser because he had published a translation of "Queen Mab."

2.—The *Anzeiger* to ANGLIA VI opens with a long review by W. Schumann of Dr. Morris's *Genesis and Exodus*, A. D. 1250 (E. E. T. Society, 1874). After some remarks on Morris's Introduction, with references also to Fritzsche's article in *Anglia* V 43, and to Hilmer's *Gymnasialprogramm* (Sondershausen, 1876), Schumann gives nearly thirty pages of notes, both critical and explanatory, on about 150 passages of the poem. Lack of space will not permit a summary of these reviews and book-notices, but a mere enumeration must suffice. L. Morsbach reviews Thum's *Anmerkungen zu Macaulay's History of England*, and Hoppe's edition of Dickens's *Cricket on the Hearth*; H. Löschnhorn, J. Koch's *Siebenschläfer Legende, ihr Ursprung und ihre Verbreitung*; F. H. Stratmann, Kölbings *Sir Tristrem*; E. Peters, Holder's *Baeda*, in his *Germanischer Bücherschatz*. Here is Baeda's complete history for 4.50 marks; the reviewer congratulates the public on this fact. While mentioning the English editions of Stevenson and Giles, he omits those of Moberly and Lumby. J. Koch excoriates Wihlidal's Chaucer's 'Knights Tale,' calling it "Ein in jeder beziehung elendes machwerk," and his notice abundantly substantiates this criticism. R. Wülcker reviews Mentzel's *Geschichte der Schauspielkunst* in Frankfurt am Main; J. Koch, *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* by Quousque Tandem, in which some ideas are presented that deserve attention in America, as well as in Germany; E. Peters, Wagner's *Visio Tnugdali*, lateinisch und altdeutsch. E. Eienkel adds an *Erklärung gegen Schipper*, still holding to his previously expressed views, but very unnecessarily reflecting upon a writer in 'The Nation' of Oct. 12, 1882 (No. 902), who supports Schipper's views. I cannot notice this controversy further. (See above.) M. Trautmann notices, with highly appreciative comments, Professor Child's new edition of *English and Scottish Ballads*, Part I, and gives a synopsis of the contents of its 28 pieces. L. Morsbach briefly dispatches Hierthes, *Wörterbuch des schottischen Dialekts in den werken von Walter Scott und Burns*, as "das stümperhafte machwerk," and says that it may be recommended to students only "damit sie frühe lernen, wie man es *nicht* machen solle." R. Wülcker closes this number of the *Anzeiger* with a notice of Furnivall's edition of the *Digby Mysteries* (New Shakspeare Society, 1882), containing three Mysteries now published for the first time, though fifty copies of the Digby MS were once printed by the Abbotsford Club.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

HERMES, 1882.

No. III.

Wilamowitz, of Greifswald, A paper on the Heraclidae of Euripides. The most important of the four chapters in this paper is the first one. W. argues that there are imperfections in the extant drama so gross as to compel the critic to infer not merely that the piece is transmitted to us in bad shape, but that we have not before us the original Euripidean composition at all, and that we now read the play as recast by a later playwright of the histrionic profession.

Wilamowitz's criticism in this part of the discussion consists mainly in considerations bearing upon dramatic propriety.

Macaria, in order to insure victory for the hospitable arms of protecting Athens (in accordance with the condition of the oracle), announces her intention of sacrificing herself. She departs with the words, 595 (Kirchhoff)

. . . τὸ γὰρ θανεῖν  
κακῶν μέγιστον φάρμακον νομίζεται.

One would expect to hear a report of her end from some ἀγγελος, with a monody of lamentation from the lips of her grandmother Alcmena, but we are met by an utter absence of these essential stages in the development of the action. W. argues earnestly and ingeniously against the assumption of a mere lacuna in the text. W. finds in Eurip. fragm. 848, ὅστις δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας ἐν βίῳ σέβει κτέ the conclusion of the missing report of Macaria's death, assigns a place in the original drama to the three verses now classed as fragm. 219 (Antiope), and condemns the present parodos of the Heraclidae. This recasting of the play he assumes to have been made by a stage manager of the fourth century B. C., a man not actuated by literary vanity so much as by practical regard for stage uses.<sup>1</sup>

O. Rossbach, De Senecae Dialogis. How far do the extant works of Seneca admit that title? Quintilian X 1, 128 quotes *dialogi*. Generally editors have been rating Seneca's *dialogi* as *libri deperditi*, but Rossbach, from a special inspection of the Milan MS of S., infers that the word *dialogi* really refers to a number of extant writings of Seneca. Of course the word *dialogus* must be taken not in the Platonic sense, but rather in the same way in which it applies to the discursive treatises, rhetorical and philosophical, of Cicero, opposing views being brought forward and combated, although represented by no definite character or personality. Interesting remarks are subjoined on the estimate put upon Seneca's books in subsequent times.

Diels,<sup>2</sup> Stichometrisches. D. takes exception to some views advanced by Th. Birt ("Ueber das antike Buchwesen"), and basing his own theory on a passage in Galen (V 655 Kühn, 656, 6, Müller) comes to the following conclusion: The ancient normal stichos, while substantially representing the bulk of an heroic hexameter, was based not on the counting of letters, but of syllables, the latter averaging sixteen in number.

I. Vahlen, Varia. We have noted in former reports that in textual criticism this eminent scholar pursues a conservative tendency. How much his influence

<sup>1</sup> Some of W.'s statements are far too positive, p. 341: Wie das Stück vorliegt, ist die verwunderte Frage des Iolaos ob denn die Entscheidung so nahe sei, *nothwendig*. . . . Aber die Entscheidung ist hier minder leicht und sicher, weil so ziemlich die ganze Scene 630-60 dem Bearbeiter zufallen muss. It may be worth while to compare the following sentences of W.'s with the lines of Euripides: "In der That bin ich froh dass Euripides an den Geschmacklosigkeiten dieser Verse unschuldig ist. Iolaos ruft die Alcmene nicht lauter heraus als nöthig ist, damit sie ihn hört, ja wie es scheint nicht laut genug, denn die Begründung seines Rufes (644-5) hat sie offenbar überhört. Sie poltert nämlich heraus, behauptet der ganze Tempel wäre voll Geschrei gewesen, herrscht den unschuldigen Knappen an, im Glauben er wäre Kopreus, und droht ihm mit Thätlichkeiten." But is it not intrinsically probable that Alcmene, in her despondency and gloom, is prepared in advance for no message but one demanding extradition, for no news but bad news, for no messenger but one from Argos? The text really does not suggest her believing that she beholds Kopreus himself, for she says, 647:

Ἰόλαε, μὲν τίς σ' εὖ βιάζεται  
κῆρυξ ἀπ' Ἀργούς.

E. G. S.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Amer. Jour. of Philol. 1882, p. 108.

will prevail against the long-established bias of many German scholars towards reckless ἀθέτησις, time will show. Suffice it to say here that the ample learning, the circumspect use of analogy, the employment of sound methods of criticism, make the papers of Vahlen very instructive indeed. In the first note he proves, against Ritschl and Lachmann, that *et* in Plautus and in Lucretius *does* occur in the sense of *etiam*. In the second discussion (on Plato Phaedr. 236 *b*), he maintains the MS reading *στάθητι* against Cobet and Schanz. Also in the passage a little below (236 *c*), ῥητέον μὲν γάρ σοι παντὸς μᾶλλον κτέ, he shows that the MS reading, with proper pointing, makes better sense and grammar than the text as changed by Cobet and Schanz.

Th. Mordtmann (Pera) attacks the authenticity of a number of inscriptions and MSS which Francois Lenormant has been publishing within the last twenty years. This is followed by H. Roehl (Berlin), In Franciscum Lenormant Inscriptionum Falsarium, in which Lenormant is called to account for a long string of forgeries. Among the scholars who condemn Lenormant's unsupported statements are mentioned Kirchhoff, Kumanudis, Koehler, Kaibel, Dittenberger. Near the end of his paper Roehl says: Dicet quispiam, petendum esse a Lenormanto ut duos catalogos antiquitatum a se editarum publici iuris faciat, alterum genuinarum, alterum fictarum. Nos hoc non petimus; quis enim fidem ei habiturus esset?

C. Robert. König Philipp V und die Larisaeer. Robert reprints with slight critical alterations an inscription of Larisa, Thessaly, discovered by H. G. Lolling. This inscription is a record of a certain transaction of the commonwealth of Larisa. The time is probably the earlier years of the Hannibalian epoch. King Philip (father of Perseus), last but one of the Macedonian dynasty, strongly urges Larisa to adopt into full citizenship their metics (*i. e.* those of Greek nationality), so as to strengthen both Larisa itself as well as the royal interest. This matter the king urged in two letters, the first of which (according to Mommsen's appended commentary) was written in 220 B. C., the second in 214. Both of these letters are incorporated in the record together with the decree asked for, as well as lists of those who consequently received the franchise. This inscription enables us to realize more vividly than could be done before the political situation as regards Rome and Greece in that age. The inscription on the grammatical side affords the student ample illustration of Thessalian phonetics and inflection, being of near kin to the Aeolian dialect of Lesbos, etc. A few specimens may here be given: *κίς* = *τίς*; *διέ κί* = *διὰ τί*; *ποχ κί* = *πρὸς τί*; *ἐμμεν* = *εἶναι*; *κατθέμεν* = *κατθεῖναι*; *ἀπύ* = *ἀπό*; *ὄνυμα* = *ὄνομα*, Attic *ω* is invariably represented by *ου*: *e. g.* *Φεῖδουν*, *Κίμων*, *τοῦν ἄλλουν*, *Ἑλλάνουν*, . . . *τοῦν χρεισιμουν* (*χρησίμων*); *ποτεδέετο* = *προσεδεῖτο*; *τοῖ βασιλείος* = *τοῦ βασιλέως*; *ἐσγόνοις* = *ἐκγόνοις*; *ἐσδόμεν* = *ἐκδοῦναι*; *ὀγγράψαντας* = *ἀναγράφαντας*. Literature probably was but little practiced amongst the Thessalian lairds (unless by hiring alien celebrities), and the consequent wearing away of inflection and the tendency towards apocopé and assimilation are evident in the present inscription: *ποκ κί*, *ποτ τὸς ταγός*, *κατ τὰν ἐπιστολάν*. *ἐν* takes the accus. (= *εἰς c. acc.*) *e. g.* *κατθέμεν τὰμ μὲν ἱαν ἐν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπλωνος*.

Kühlewein (Ilfeld) gives some specimens of a Latin version of Hippocrates' Aphorisms found in Codex 97 at Monte Cassino. This copy (it is evidently a



This interesting document proves that *municipia*, in the matter of domestic celebration, made their own decrees independently of the Roman Senate. Thus, under date of Sept. 23, there is "Immolatio Caesari hostia" (ā), whereas at the capital, divine honors were officially paid to Augustus only after his death. We notice, too, that the municipium of Cumae had no official annual celebration of Actium, whereas the accession of Lepidus' army to the standards of Octavianus is set down for Sep. 3. The historical value of the inscription is so considerable that the readers of the Journal will be glad to possess it entire.

Aug. 19. [XIIII K. Septembr. Eo die Caesar pri]mum consulatum in[iit. Supplicatio] . . .

Sept. 3. [III Non. Septembr. Eo die exer]citus Lepidi tradidit se Caesari. Suppli[c]a[tio] . . .

Sept. 23. [VIII K. Octobr. N]atalis Caesaris. Immolatio Caesari hostia; supplicatio [sic] . . .

Oct. 5. Nonis Octobr. Drusi Caesaris natalis. Supplicatio Vestae.

Oct. 18. XV K. Novimbr. Eo die Caesar togam virilem sumpsit. Supplicatio Spei et Iuve[ntuti] . . .

Nov. 16. XVI K. Dicimbr. Natalis Ti. Caesaris. Supplicatio Vestae.

Dec. 15. XVIII K. Januar. Eo die a[r]a Fortunae reducis dedicatast, quae Caesarem A[ugustum ex transmari]nis provinciis red[uxit]. Supplicatio Fortunae reduci.

Jan. 7. VII idus Januar. E[o die Caesar] primum fasces sumpsit. Supplicatio [sic] Iovi[sempi]terno].

Jan. 16. [XV]III [sic] K. Febr. Eo di[e Caesar Augustu]s appellatus est. Supplicatio Au[gusto].

Jan. 30. [III K. Febr. Eo die ara Pacis Aug. dedicata] est. Supplicatio impe[r]io Caesaris Augusti cust[odis] [civium Romanorum orbisque terrar]um.

Mart. 6. [pridie Non. Mart. Eo die Caesar pontifex ma]ximus creatus est. Supplicato [sic] Vestae, dis pub[licis] P(enatibus) p(opuli) R(oman). Q(uiritium).

Apr. 14. [XVIII Kal. Mai. Eo die Caesar primum vicit. Suppli]catio Victoriae Augustae.

Apr. 15. [XVII Kal. Mai. Eo die Caesar primum imperator app]ellatus est. Supplicatio Félicitati imperi.

Mai. 12. [IIII id. Mai. Eo die aedes Martis dedicatest. Supplica]tio Mólibus Mártis.

Mai. 24. [VIII K. Jun. Germanici Caesaris natalis. Supp]licatio Vestae.

Jul. 12. [IIII id. Jul. Natalis divi Juli. Supplicatio Iov]i, Marti ultori, Veneri [genetrici] . . . [Suppli]catio Iovi.

E. G. SIHLER.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

SEBASTE, TURKEY IN ASIA, *August 10, 1883.*

*Sir:*

Those of your readers who are interested in the exploration of Greek antiquity in the East, are no doubt acquainted with the work in Asia Minor during the past three years, of Mr. W. M. Ramsay, of Oxford. But for the information of those who are not familiar with the archaeological doings of the day, it may be necessary to state that the object of Mr. Ramsay's journeys is to illustrate the history of Asia Minor by a careful and comprehensive study of all the existing remains of antiquity. Accordingly copies and impressions of inscriptions are made, the sculptured monuments are drawn and described, coins of cities are collected as far as feasible, and in short, the aim is to do everything that will in any way illustrate or increase our knowledge of Greek and Roman antiquity in Asia Minor. Last winter in Athens it was, of course, well known in archaeological circles that Mr. Ramsay contemplated an extensive tour in Asia Minor during the present summer, and it was also known to a few that two members of the French school at Athens had a similar archaeological journey in view. Mr. Ramsay was asked to give a minute description of the route he proposed to take, in order that the Frenchmen might traverse a different district and not interfere in the least with the English expedition. In explanation of what follows it is perhaps proper to state that the writer was invited to join the English expedition.

The Frenchmen left Saraikieui, the present terminus of the Ottoman Railway, about ten days before we did. One of the two became ill and returned to Smyrna, leaving M. Paris to continue the journey alone. We had not proceeded far, when we were astonished to find ourselves upon his trail. We could see what he had done, or more properly speaking what he had left undone. We noticed that he left whole series of villages unvisited and unexplored. Even in places he had touched we saw that much had been left undone that might easily have been done with but small expenditure of time and energy. For instance, in one village we copied nine inscriptions which M. Paris had left untouched. This we knew because some digging and adjustment of fragments was necessary in order to read the inscriptions. All this very apparent hurry led us to believe that M. Paris was heading for the eastern country, and took cognizance of things in intermediate districts simply *en passant*.

But it appears, as will be seen presently, that this was intended for earnest work in the line of archaeological research. After a time we passed through the villages Sevaslee and Seljikler, in the neighborhood of which the ancient Sebaste was situated, its name being preserved in the modern Sevaslee. Ten days after our visit to these villages the July number of the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*—the publication of the French school at Athens—came to hand. This July number was published in advance of the May and June



numbers; at least the latter had not yet reached the subscribers in Smyrna. In the July number we found a paper on the inscriptions of Sebaste, by M. Paris. He had brought his short excursion to an abrupt termination and had gone to Smyrna to publish the results of his journey. A glance at his paper sufficed to reveal to us errors in almost all of the inscriptions. We were thoroughly convinced of the accuracy of our readings, but when, in the course of our zigzags, we found ourselves once more in the neighborhood of Sevaslee and Seljikler, it was made convenient for the writer to revisit those villages in order to verify our own readings as well as those of M. Paris. Besides this, impressions of the stones were made, so that the accuracy of the statements which follow may be easily verified. The long inscription published by M. Paris bears the date 99 A. D., and most probably marks an era in the Hellenisation of the city of Sebaste. The *γερουσία* was a feature of Greek cities, and as the cities of the interior became Hellenized they adopted, among other things, the institution of the *γερουσία*. So that on the whole it may be safely assumed that the stone was erected in commemoration of the organization of the *γερουσία* in Sebaste. It may, however, be noted that the interpretation of M. Paris is altogether different.

In lines 1-2, M. Paris reads *Ἀσκληπιάδου Ἑρμογένους*. It is true that here the stone is much worn, but nevertheless *Ἀσκληπιάδου τοῦ Ἑρμογένους* may be easily distinguished. In line 4, M. Paris reads [—]να τοῦ καὶ Ἀντωνίου, but the stone has Παπᾶ τοῦ καὶ Ἀντωνίου. In line 29, col. 1, he reads *Μηνόφιλος Βλέπιδος φύσει Εὐπάτορος*. It is true that here M. Paris has the correct reading so far as the letters themselves are concerned, if I may except a distinct and unmistakable dot both before and after the B of his word *Βλέπιδος*. Still that he understands the signification of the letters is a daring assumption. I need scarcely mention that *Μηνόφιλος β'* is the short way of indicating that the man in question bore the same name as his father, or in other words it stands in place of *Μηνόφιλος Μηνοφίλου*. It was usual to write the second name of a man after that of his father, so that the passage under discussion is clearly *Μηνόφιλος δις Λέπιδος φύσει Εὐπάτορος*. In line 31, col. 1, M. Paris reads *Ἰλέγων*; the stone has φλέγων. The down-stroke of the φ is bold, while the circular part is quite small, but it is very plain even in the impression. In lines 40-41, M. Paris gives up the contest and reads:

Ἀλέξανδρος Μελίτωνος ΔΟΝ  
Διόδωρος Ξανθίππου Γεῖνος.

This apparent difficulty is easily explained. The stonecutter inserted the latter half of the word *Δουγεῖνος* under the ΔΟΝ in line 41, seeing that the space in line 40 was limited. The *-γεῖνος* is not horizontal, but runs at a small angle upwards, from which it is clear that line 40 must read *Ἀλέξανδρος Μελίτωνος Δουγεῖνος*.

In line 46, col. 1, M. Paris reads *Γέμιος Δάδων*; the stone has *Γέμιος Λάδων*. The name *Γέμιος* sounds queer enough, and may be a mistake on the part of the stonecutter for *Γέλλιος*, but the M is certain. In lines 41-42, col. 2, M. Paris reads Παπᾶς Ἰπποκρίτου τοῦ καὶ Νοντάνου, and assures us that both his copy and his impression have *Νοντάνου*, not *Μοντάνου*. This is doubtless true, but the stone and my impression both read unmistakably *Μοντάνου*, and just as unmistakably

Μηνοκρίτου instead of the Ἴπποκρίτου of M. Paris; that is, Παπᾶς Μηνοκρίτου τοῦ καὶ Μοντάνου.

For the sake of completeness and easy reference the text of the inscription is inserted here.

Ἀγαθὴ Τύχη

Ἔτους ρπγ ἐπὶ ἱερέων Ἀσκληπιάδου  
τοῦ Ἑρμογένους καὶ Ξάνθου Ἀρτέμων[ος].  
οἱ ἰσελθόντες [εἰς] τὴν γερουσίαν·  
Θεογένης Παπᾶ τοῦ καὶ Ἀντωνίου,  
Ἀριστῶνις Γλύκωνος, Διόδωρος Ἴπποδάμου,

5

COLUMN I.

- Μένανδρος Διονυσίου,  
Παπᾶς Κέλσου,  
Διόδωρος Μηνοφίλου,  
Διονύσιος Ἀριστέου,  
10 Ἡλιᾶς Ἀπολλωνίου,  
Θεογένης Θεογένους ἱατρός,  
Ἴππόνεικος Ἀρτεμιδώρου,  
Διονύσιος Νίγερως,  
Δάδης Ἀλεξάνδρου,  
15 Φίρμιος Πατροκλέους,  
Μόσχως Ἴππονείκου,  
Νεικασίων Βύλλωνος,  
Εὐφραστος Καίσαρος,  
Μάρκος Οὐαλέριος Κρίσφος στρατιώτης,  
20 Ἀθᾶνις Ἀπελλᾶ,  
Ἑρμογένης Νεικασίωνος,  
Κοίαρτος Ἀπολ-  
λωνίου,  
Μόσχως Μενάνδρου,  
25 Πατροκλῆς Διοδώρου,  
Μόσχως Ἀπελλᾶ,  
Ῥώμαις Ἀπολλωνίου,  
Πρωτᾶς Ἀντιφώντος,  
Μηνόφιλος . Β . Λέπιδος  
30 φύσει Εὐπάτορος,  
Μ. Οὐαλέριος Φλέγων,  
Ἀτταλὸς Ἀρτεμιδώρου,  
Γάιος Οὐαλέριος Λό[ν]γος στρατιώτης,  
Μελίτων Κώκου,  
35 Σισίνης Μενεστράτου,  
Νεικᾶς Τιμοθέου,  
Γάιος Καρβεῖλις Γαίου υἱός,  
Φαβία, Μιθραδάτης,  
Δημήτριος Ἀππᾶ,  
40 Ἀλέξανδρος Μελίτωνος Λον-

COLUMN II.

- Διονύσιος Διονυσίου,  
Ἀσκλᾶς Κέλσου,  
Θευδᾶς Ἀριβάζου,  
Μοσχᾶς Μενεστράτου,  
Μενεσθεὺς Θευδᾶ,  
Ἀλέξανδρος Θευδᾶ,  
Μηνόκριτος Ξάνθου,  
Ἀνδρῶν Διοδώρου,  
Ἴππόνεικος Ἀντιφώντος,  
Ἀλέξανδρος Μενάνδρου,  
Γλύκων Ἀριστῶνιδος,  
Ἀντιφῶν Πρωτομάχου,  
Γ. Ἰούλιος Πρόκλος,  
Κλαυδία Τειθραντίς,  
Γ. Ἰούλιος Πρόκλος υἱός,  
Ἰουλία Ἰουλιανῇ θυγάτηρ,  
Γ. Ἰούλιος Πρόκλος Αἰλιανός,  
Γ. Ἰούλιος Γερμανός,  
Μοσχᾶς Ἀππᾶ,  
Ἀντυλλὸς Φιλοπάτορος,  
Διονύσιος Διωνυ-  
σίου Φλαουιανός,  
Ἔλος Ἀλφιος Ἀπερ,  
Ἀριστέας Διονυσίου,  
Κράτης Ἴπ-  
ποδάμου,  
Νεικομᾶς Σόλωνος,  
Ἀπελλᾶς  
Ἀπελλᾶ,  
Εὐμένης Ἀπολ-  
λωνίου,

## COLUMN I.

Διόδωρος Ξανθίππου, -γείνος,  
 Παπᾶς Ἀμφικάτου,  
 Μελίτων Μελιτωνος,  
 Ἀλεξάνδρος Τειμοθέου,  
 15 Διόδωρος Τίτου,  
 Γε[?]ιος Λαδών,  
 Ἰουλιὰ Τειθοῦν[τίς]  
 Πρωκλὸν θυγατῆρ,

## COLUMN II.

Παπᾶς Μηνοκρίτου  
 τοῦ καὶ Μοντάνου,  
 Ἀνδρέας Μάρ-  
 κου,  
 Διόδωρος  
 Πατροκλέους,

There is much doubt and uncertainty about the functions of the priests and priestesses of the Roman Emperors, as well as concerning the date of the institution of the office. Consequently all inscriptions which bear on this interesting point are of great importance, especially if they are dated, as is the case with the following inscription. The date of an inscription is always important, and it is in regard to the date of this inscription that M. Paris has sinned grievously. The stone has ΕΤΟΥΣ • ΣΠΘ in large and perfectly preserved letters, with an unmistakable dot between the two Σ's. This makes the date 205 A. D., whereas M. Paris leaves out the Σ of the date and reads ΠΘ, that is, 5 A. D. Thus he misses the truth by a matter of 200 years.

Κατὰ τὰ πολλάκις δόξαντα  
 τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ  
 Μεμμίαν Ἀρίστην Τευθραν-  
 τίδα ἀρχιέρειαν τῆς Ἀσίας  
 οἱ ἴδιοι θρεπτοὶ παρ' ἐαυτῶν,  
 ἐπιμελησαμένον Κ. Μεμμίου  
 Κύρου τοῦ τροφέως αὐτῆς •  
 ἔτους σπθ', μη(νὸς) ια', κ' •

The inscription is in the wall of the minaret of the mosque. It is noteworthy that on a ground stone of this same minaret there is another inscription, not ten feet distant from the one given above. For this inscription we look in vain in the paper of M. Paris.

In the following inscription M. Paris reads ποιησαμένης instead of προνοησαμένης. The letters νοη are in ligature, so that the ν and the η are combined, and above them is a small ο; the π and ρ were also most probably in ligature, although in my copy I find π alone.

[Ἀγα]θὴ τύχη

Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησεν  
 Κόϊ(ντον) Μέμμιον Χαρίδημον  
 Τείθραντα, Ἀσίας ἀρχιερέων  
 ἐγγονον, ἥρωα, ἀριστον ῥήτορα,  
 τῆς ἀναστάσεως π[ρ]ονοησαμένης  
 Στατειλίας Καλλιγόνης τῆς  
 μητρὸς αὐτοῦ •  
 ἔτους τκθ', μη(νὸς) θ'.

Date 245 A. D.

In the following inscription in the yard of the Mussafir Odah of Seljikler, M. Paris wonders at the strange form παντοπώλης. Unfortunately the stone has παντοπώλης pure and simple.

Not having the Bulletin beside me, I do not know what M. Paris has made of the praenomen in line 1. The stone is broken at the commencement for the space of three letters. The first letter is gone; the second is probably an N, the third is either a T or a Γ. The praenomen may be 'Αντ., but cannot be Αύρ.

[ 'Αντ ? ] Πωλλίων παντοπώλης  
αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ Αὐρ.  
'Αμμία Ζηνοδότου καὶ τοῖς  
τέκνοις αὐτοῦ κατεσκεύασεν  
ζῶν τὸ ἡρώον · εἰ δέ τις ἕτερον  
ἐπισενέγκῃ τινὰ ἔστε αὐτῷ  
πρὸς τὸν θεόν.  
ἔτους τμ', μη(νὸς) θ', κ'.

Date 256 A. D.

J. R. S. STERRETT.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### BRITISH.

**Aristophanes.** *Acharnians.* Translated into English verse by Robert Yelverton Tyrrell. (Dublin University Press Series.) Post 8vo, pp. 66. *Hodges, Dublin.* *Longmans.* 2s. 6d.

**Aristotle.** *Politics.* Translated, with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by J. E. C. Welldon. Post 8vo, pp. 480. *Macmillan.* 10s. 6d.

**Cicero.** *Pro Publio Sestio Oratio ad Judices.* With Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Appendix, by the Rev. Herbert A. Holden. 12mo, pp. 352. *Macmillan.* 5s.

**Dobree's** *Adversaria cum Præfatione G. Wagneri.* Volumen 3, *Miscellanæ Observationes ad varios Scriptores Græcos.* (Bohn's Collegiate Series.) 12mo. *Bell & Son.* 5s.

**Euripides.** *Hercules Furens.* By F. A. Paley. Fcap. 8vo. *Bell & Sons.* 1s. 6d.

**Geldart (E. M.)** *A Guide to Modern Greek.* Post 8vo, pp. 286. (Key, pp. 28, 2s. 6d.) *Trübner.* 7s. 6d.

**Homer's** *Odyssey.* Book 1, edited for the Use of Schools, by Rev. John Bond and A. S. Walpole, with Notes and Vocabulary. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, pp. 120. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

**Horace.** *Odes.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. E. Page. 12mo, pp. 484. *Macmillan.* 6s.

— *Satires.* Edited, with Notes, by Arthur Palmer. 18mo, pp. 436. *Macmillan.* 6s.

**King (Rev. James).** *Cleopatra's Needle: A History of the London Obelisk.* Crown 8vo, pp. 128. *Religious Tract Society.* 2s. 6d.

**Livy.** Book 1. Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, for the use of Schools, by Rev. H. M. Stephenson. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, pp. 160. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

**Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle.** Compiled by Edwin Wallace. 3d ed. Fcap. 8vo. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 4s. 6d.

**Sellar (W. Y.)** *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age—Virgil.* 2d ed. Post 8vo, pp. 432. *Frowde.* 9s.

**Sonnenschein (E. A.)** *Bentley's Plautine Emendations, from his Copy of Gronovius.* Small 4to. *Oxford Warehouse.* 2s. 6d.

**Whinfield (E. H.)** *The Quatrains of Omar Khayyám.* The Persian Text, with an English Verse Translation. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) 8vo, pp. 340. *Trübner.* 10s. 6d.

**Xenophon's** *Memorabilia.* Book 1. With Notes by Rev. C. E. Moberley. 2d ed. Fcap. 8vo, pp. 82. *Rivingtons.* 2s.

DUTCH.

Gericke (J. F. C.), en Roorda (T.) Javaansch-Nederduitsch woordenboek, vermeerderd en verbeterd door A. C. Vreede. 1 Aft. Amsterdam, 1883. 8vo, p. 1-28. 5m. 50.

FRENCH.

Adam (Lucien). Les Idiomes négro-aryen et maléo-aryen, Essai d'hybridologie linguistique. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr. 50.

Arbois de Jubainville (H. d'). Essai d'un catalogue de la littérature épique de l'Irlande, précédé d'une étude sur les manuscrits en langue irlandaise conservés dans les Iles britanniques et sur le continent. In-8. *Thorin*. 12 fr.

Baret (Adrien). Étude sur la langue anglaise au XIV siècle. In-8. *Cerf*. 5 fr.

Chandos. Le Prince noir; poème du héraut d'armes Chandos. Texte critique, suivi de notes, par Francisque-Michel. In-4. Texte en vieux français; traduction anglaise, préface et notes en anglais. *Fotheringham*. 55 fr.

Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum ab Academia inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum conditum atque digestum. Pars prima, inscriptiones Phoenicias continens. Tomus I, fasciculus 2. In-4, avec album de planches in-folio. (Impr. Nationale.) *Klincksieck*. 25 fr.

Darmesteter (James). Essais de littérature anglaise. In-12. *Delagrave*. 3 fr. 50.

— Études sur l'Avesta; observations sur le Vendidad. In-8. Extrait du Journal asiatique. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr. 50.

Duperré de Lisle (Mme. F.) Étude sur la prononciation française. Avec deux lettres de M. Legouvé et M. Got. In-12. *Delagrave*. 2 fr. 75.

Henry (Victor). Études sur l'analogie en général et sur les formations analogues de la langue grecque. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 8 fr.

Des Michels (Abel). Les Poèmes de l'Annam. Luc Van Tiên Ca Diên. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 20 fr.

Ptolémée. Claudii Ptolemaei geographia. E codicibus recognovit, prolegomenis, annotatione, indicibus, tabulis instruxit Carolus Müllerus. Voluminis primi pars prima. Gr. in-8. *F. Didot*. 15 fr.

Schweisthal (Martin). Remarques sur le rôle de l'élément franc dans la formation de la langue française. In-8. *Leroux*. 2 fr.

GERMAN.

Abel (Dr. Carl). Üb. den Gegensinn der Urworte. gr. 8, iii, 65 S. Leipzig, 1884, *Friedrich*. n. 2.

Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusae. Rec. Adph. v. Velsen. gr. 8, 88 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 2.

Aristotelis quae feruntur Magna Moralia. Recognovit Franc. Susemihl. 8, xix, 126 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.20.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Dr. Alb. Bezzenger. 8 Bd. gr. 8. (1 u. 2 Hft. 184 S. m. 1 autogr. Taf.) Göttingen, *Peppmüller*. n. 10.



Cicero's Rede üb. das Imperium d. Cn. Pompejus. Hrsg. v. Fr. Richter. 3 Aufl. v. Alfr. Eberhard. gr. 8. 76 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. —60.

Cicero's Rede f. L. Flaccus. Erklärt v. Adf. du Mesnil. gr. 8, vi. 235 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 3.60.

Clasen (Chrn.) Historisch-kritische Untersuchungen üb. Timaios v. Tauro-menion. gr. 8, 97 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. n. 2.40.

Classiker, deutsche, d. Mittelalters. Mit Word- u. Sacherklärgn. Begründet v. Frz. Pfeiffer. 12 Bd. 8. Leipzig, *Brockhaus*. n. 3.50; geb. n. 4.50. Inhalt: Erzählungen u. Schwänke. Hrsg. v. Hans Lambel. 2 Aufl. xv, 374 S.

Commentationes philologiae Jenenses, edd. seminarii philologorum Jenensis professores. Vol. II. gr. 8, iii, 327 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 6. (I et II, n. 11.)

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae editum. Vol. IX. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. cart. n. 90. Inhalt: Inscriptiones Calabriae, Apuliae, Samnii. Sabinorum, Piceni latinae, ed. Thdr. Mommsen. (lxix, 52 u. 847 S. m. eingedr. Fig. u. 4 chromolith. Karten.)

— Vol. X. Ed. Thdr. Mommsen. 2 partes. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. cart. n. 124. (I–VIII et X, n. 795.75.) Inhalt: 1. Inscriptiones Bruttiorum, Lucaniae, Campaniae. lxi, 712 S. 2. Inscriptiones Siciliae et Sardiniae, ed. Thdr. Mommsen. (S. 713–1229 m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 5 chromolith. Karten.)

Dehner (Seb.) Hadriani reliquiae. Particula I. Diss. gr. 8, 43 S. Bonn, *Behrendt*. n. 1.20.

Dieterici (Fr.) Die Abhandlungen der Ichwân Es-Safâ in Auswahl. Zum ersten Mal aus arab. Handschriften hrsg. gr. 8, v, 172 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 6.

— Die sogenannte Theologie d. Aristoteles, aus dem Arab. übers. u. m. Anmerkgn. versehen. gr. 8, xviii, 224 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 8.

Dillon (Dr. Emil J. v.) Die Umschreibung der eranischen Sprachen. 8, 16 S. Leipzig, *Gerhard*. n. —60.

Duncker (R.) De Paeanio Eutropii interprete. gr. 4, 21 S. Greiffenberg i. Pomm., 1880. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.

— Inter priuatarum causarum orationes Demosthenicas quae pro genuinis habendae sint quaeque pro falsis breuiter exponitur. Pars I. gr. 4, 17 S. Ebd. 1877. baar n. 1.

Engelbrecht (Aug. Gfr.) *Studia Terentiana*. gr. 8, 90 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 3.

Euclidis opera omnia. Edd. J. L. Heiberg et H. Menge. (Vol. I.) Elementa. Ed. et latine interpretatus est Dr. J. L. Heiberg. Vol. I. Libros I–IV continens. 8, x, 333 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 3.60.

Ewald (Paulus), et Loewe (Gust.) *Exempla scripturae visigoticae* XL tabulis expressa. Fol. viii, 30 S. Heidelberg, *Köster*. In Mappe. baar n.n. 50.

Fellmann (Max.) De ὥς, ὥστε particulis consecutivis earumque apud tragicos Graecorum poetas vi et usu. Diss. gr. 8, 80 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. baar n. 1.

Fokke (A.) Rettungen d. Alkibiades. 1 Tl. Die sicil. Expedition. gr. 8, iv, 87 S. Emden, *Haynel*. n. 1.75.

Frantz (Joh.) Die Kriege der Scipionen in Spanien 536–548 a. u. c. gr. 8, v, 77 S. München, *Th. Ackermann*. n. 1.60.





Jebb (R. C.) Die Reden d. Thukydides. Autoris. Übersetzg. v. J. Imelmann. gr. 8, iii, 65 S. Berlin, *W. Weber*. n. 1.60.

Keller (Otto). Der saturnische Vers als rythmisch erwiesen. gr. 8, 83 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. n. 1.50.

Kirchhoff (Fr. Chr.) Neue Messungen der Überreste vom Theater d. Dionysus zu Athen. gr. 4, 7 S. Altona, *Schlüter*. n. 1.

Klimek (Paul). Conjectanea in Julianum et Cyrilli Alexandrini contra illum libros. Diss. gr. 8, 42 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. baar n. 1.

Knaack (Dr. Geo.) Conjectanea. gr. 4, 11 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 1.50.

Koch (L. G.) De principe juventutis. Diss. gr. 8, 47 S. Leipzig, *Lorentz*. baar n. 1.

Koepp (Frdr.) De gigantomachiae in poeseos artisque monumentis usu. gr. 8, 66 S. Bonn, *Strauss*. n. 2.

Köhler (Carl Sylvio). Realconcordanz der Sprüche u. Lehren in den Tragödien d. Aeschylos, Sophokles, Euripides. gr. 8, x, 200 S. Halle, *Hendel*. n. 5.

Kopp (Arth.) De Ammonii, Eranii, aliorum distinctionibus synonymicis earumque communi fonte. Diss. gr. 8, 108 S. Königsberg, *Gräfe & Unzer*. baar n. 2.

Krafft (Herm.) Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung lateinischer Autoren. gr. 8, 153 S. Aurich, *Reents in Comm.* n. 3.60.

Kremer (A. Frhr. v.) Beiträge zur arabischen Lexikographie. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 92 S. Wien, *Gerald's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1.50.

Kukula (Rich.) De tribus pseudacronianorum scholiorum recensionibus. gr. 8, v, 49 S. Wien, *Konegen*. n. 1.

Lehnerdt (Max.) De locis Plutarchi ad artem spectantibus. Diss. gr. 8, 46 S. Königsberg, *Gräfe & Unzer*. baar n. 1.

Lemm (Osc. v.) Aegyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen u. zum Privatstudium. Mit Schrifttaf. u. Glossar. 1 Thl. Schrifttafel u. Lesestücke. 1 Hft. hoch 4, 64 autogr. S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* n. 8.

Liebl (Hans). Beiträge zu den Persius-Scholien. gr. 8, 54 S. Straubing, *Attenkofer*. n. 1.50.

Literatur-Blatt f. orientalische Philologie, unter Mitwirkg. v. Dr. Johs. Klatt, hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Ernst Kuhn. 1 Jahrg. Octbr. 1883 to Septbr. 1884. 12 Hfte. (à 2-3 B.) gr. 8. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. n. 1.50.

Livii, Titi, ab urbe condita liber XXII. Erklärt v. Ed. Wöfflin. Mit e. (lith.) Kärtchen. 2 Aufl. gr. 8, vi, 102 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.20.

Lucian, ausgewählte Schriften. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Dr. Karl Jacobitz. 2 Bdchn.: Die Totengespräche. Ausgewählte Göttergespräche. Der Hahn. 2 mehrfach bericht. Aufl. gr. 8, 150 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.20.

Māitrāyaṇī Samhitā, hrsg. von Dr. Leop. v. Schroeder. 2 Buch. Gedr. auf Kosten der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellschaft. gr. 8, x, 169 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort. in Comm.* (à) n. 8.

Marcks (Joh. Frdr.) Symbola critica ad epistolographos graecos. Diss. gr. 8, 54 S. Bonn, *Bekrendt*. n. 1.20.

Matzat (Heinr.) Römische Chronologie. 1 Bd. Grundlegende Untersuchgn. gr. 8, xii, 354 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 8.

Mayerhöfer (Ant.) Die Brücken im alten Rom. gr. 8, iii, 96 S. Erlangen, *Deichert*. n. 2.

Mirsch (Paul). De M. Terenti Varronis antiquitatum rerum humanarum libris XXV. Diss. gr. 8, 144 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. baar n. 2.

Mittheilungen d. deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen. 8 Jahrg. gr. 8. (1 Hft. 80 S. m. 3 Stein-, 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 2 Beilagen.) Athen, *Wilberg in Comm.* n. 15.

Mittheilungen, archaeologisch-epigraphische, aus Oesterreich, hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. O. Hirschfeld. 7 Jahrg., 1883. gr. 8. (1 Hft. 152 S. m. 3 Taf.) Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 9.

Mommsen (Aug.) Chronologie. Untersuchungen üb. das Kalenderwesen der Griechen, insonderheit der Athener. gr. 8, viii, 532 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 14.

Mommsen (Tycho). Griechische Formenlehre. gr. 4, 48 S. Frankfurt a. M. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1.

Mordtmann (J. H.), u. Müller (D. H., DD.) Sabäische Denkmäler. Mit 8 photozinkogr. Taf. [Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Imp.-4, 114 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 9.

Müller (Joh.) Der Stil d. älteren Plinius. gr. 8, xi, 158 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner*. n. 4.

Munier (Mor.) Die Paläographie als Wissenschaft u. die Inschriften d. Mainzer Museums. 4, 29 S. m. 1 Taf. Mainz, *Diemer*. n. 1.

Neuhaeuser (Prof. Dr. Jos.) Anaximander Milesius sive vetustissima quaedam rerum universitatis conceptio restituta. Cum 1 tab. (lith.). gr. 8, xvi, 428 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn*. n. 14.

Neumann (Dr. Karl Johs.) Strabons Landeskunde v. Kaukasien. Eine Quellenuntersuchg. [Aus "Jahrb. f. d. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 36 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1.

Noethe (Heinr.) De pugna Marathonica quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8, 71 S. Susati, 1881. Leipzig, *Fock*. baar n. 1.20.

Nottrott (Miss. A.) Grammatik der Kolh-Sprache. gr. 8, 104 S. Gütersloh, 1882. Berlin, *Buchh. der Gossner'schen Mission*. baar 1.50.

Oikonomos (S. A.) 'Η νῆσος Πενάπηθος. Diss. gr. 8, 32 S. Jena, *Pohle*. baar n. —75.

Pappageorg (Pet. N.) Codex Laurentianus v. Sophokles u. c. neue Kollation im Scholien-texte. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 40 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1.

Paucker (C.) Supplementum lexicorum latinorum. Fasc. 2. gr. 8, S. 97-192. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* (à) n. 3.

Plato's ausgewählte Dialoge. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 4 Bd. Apologie. Krito. gr. 8, 92 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 1.20.

Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia. Ad codices denuo collatos ed. Mart. Schanz. Vol. VI, fasc. 2. Charmides, Laches, Lysis. gr. 8, viii, 90 S. Leipzig, *B. Tauchnitz*. n. 2.

— Charmides, Laches, Lysis. Ed. Mart. Schanz. gr. 8, 72 S. Ebd. —45.

Plauti (T. Macci). Comoediae. Rec. et enarravit Joa. Ludov. Ussing. Vol. IV pars 2, Pseudolum et Poenulum continens. gr. 8, viii, 362 S. Havniae. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel*. n.n. 10. (I-III, 1, IV, 1, 2, n.n. 56.50.)

Plotini Enneades praemisso Porphyrii de vita Plotini deque ordine librorum eius libello, ed. Ric. Volkmann. Vol. I. 8, xxxiv, 350 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 3.60.

Poetae latini minores. Rec. et emendavit Aemilius Baehrens. Vol. V. 8, 446 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 4.20. (I-V, 15.90.)

Porta linguarum orientalium. Pars I. Ed. III u. d. T.: Hebräische Grammatik m. Übungsstücken, Litteratur u. Vokabular. v. Prof. Herm. L. Strack. 8, xv, 163 S. Karlsruhe, *Reuther*. n. 2.70.

Primer in the Gã or Akra language, Gold Coast, W. Africa. 8, viii, 40 S. Basel, *Missionsbuchh. geb.* n. —60.

Probst (Arth.) Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik. I. Zur Lehre vom Verbum. gr. 8, 104 S. Leipzig, *Zangenberg & Himly*. n. 3.

— Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik. II. Zur Lehre v. den Partikeln u. Konjunktionen. gr. 8, S. 105–72. Leipzig, *Zangenberg & Himly*. n. 2. (I u. II, n. 5.)

Radloff (Dr. W.) Phonetik der nördlichen Türksprachen. Anderes Hft. Consonanten. gr. 8, xxi–xlv u. S. 101–318. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel*. n. 6. (cplt. n. 9.)

Reifferscheid (Aug.) Anecdotum Fulgentianum. 4, 10 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. baar n. —50.

Reinisch (Leo). Die Bilin-Sprache. 1 Bd. A. u. d. T.: Texte der Bilin-Sprache. Mit Unterstützg. der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. gr. 8, viii, 322 S. Leipzig, *Grieben*. n. 10.

Rheinhard (Aug.) C. Jul. Caesar's Rheinbrücke. Eine technisch-krit. Studie. Mit 3 (eingedr.) Abbildgn. Lex.-8, 16 S. Stuttgart, *Neff*. n. —50.

Rosenstiel (Frdr.) De Xenophontis historiae graecae parte bis edita. Diss. gr. 8, 54 S. Jenae, 1882. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. 1.40.

Ruete (Edm.) Die Correspondenz Ciceros in den J. 44 u. 43. Historische Dissertation. gr. 8, v, 122 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* n. 2.40.

Rumpel (Joa.) Lexicon Pindaricum. gr. 8, 498 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 12.

Rutherford (W. Gunion, M. A.) Zur Geschichte d. Atticismus. 2 Abhandlgn. Übers. v. Lehr. Dr. A. Funck. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 13 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 45 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 1.

Ružićka-Ostoić (Camilla). Transcription d. türkisch bearbeiteten Lustspieles Ajjar-i Hamza. 8, 90 S. Wien, *Lechner's Verl. in Comm.* n. 2.40.

Sallusti Crispi (C.) Bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum. Ex historiis quae extant orationes et epistolae. Rec. Aug. Schneider. gr. 8, xvi, 130 u. vi S. Prag, *Tempsky*. Leipzig, *Freitag*. n. 1.

Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben. 4 Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 7; Ausg. auf Kupferdr.-Pap. n. 10. (1–4, n. 23.60.) Inhalt: Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien, nebst Untersuchgn. üb. ihre Echtheit hrsg. v. Arth. Napier. 1 Abtlg. Text u. Varianten. x, 318 S.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, v. F. Bechtel, A. Bezenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, G. Hinrichs, R. Meister, hrsg. v. Dr. Herm. Collitz. 1 Hft. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Peppmüller*. n. 2.50. Inhalt: Die griechisch-kyprischen Inschriften in epichorischer Schrift. Text u. Umschreibg. m. e. (autogr.) Schrifttaf. v. Lyc.-Dir. Dr. Wilh. Deecke. 80 S.

Sartorius (Max). Die Entwicklung der Astronomie bei den Griechen bis Anaxagoras u. Empedokles, in besond. Anschluss am Theophrast. Diss. gr. 8, 39 S. Halle. Breslau, *Köhler*. baar u. 1.

Sauppe (Herm.) Emendationes Plutarchae. 4, 15 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* baar n. —80.

Schack (Gr. v.) Die Unterweisung d. Königs Amenemhat I. 1 Hälfte, hoch 4. 21 autogr. S. Paris, *Vieweg*. n. 4.

Schmitt (Heinr. Ludw.) Quaestiones chronologicae ad Thucydidem pertinentes. Diss. gr. 8, 105 S. Leipzig, 1882, *Teubner*. n. 1.60.

Schrader (Dr. O.) Sprachvergleichung u. Urgeschichte. gr. 8, x, 490 S. Jena, *Castenoble*. n. 11.

Schuchardt (Hugo). Üb. die Benguelasprache. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] I. ex.-8, 14 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —30.

Schurz (Dr. Wilh.) De mutationibus in imperio Romano ordinando ab imperatore Hadriano factis. gr. 8, vi, 68 S. Bonn, *Strauss*. n. 2.

Seemann (Heinr.) De asyndeto Sophocleo quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Breslau, 1882, *Köhler*. baar n. 1.

Sellge (Jul.) De studiis in Sallustio Crispo a Pompeio Trogo et Justino epitomatore collocatis. Diss. gr. 8, 96 S. Sagan, 1882. Breslau, *Köhler*. baar n. 1.

Servii Grammatici in Vergilii carmina commentarii, recensuerunt Geo. Thilo et Herm. Hagen. Vol. II, fasc. I. In Aeneidos libros VI–VIII commentarii. gr. 8, 306 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 10. (I et II, 1, n. 34.)

Sittl (Karl). Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander den Grossen. 1 Tl. gr. 8, vi, 359 S. München, 1884, *Th. Ackermann*. n. 4.80.

Sophokles. Erklärt v. Gust. Wolff. 5 Tl.: Oidipus auf Kolonos v. Ludw. Bellermand. gr. 8, vi, 202 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.50. (1–5, 6.30).

Stern (Ernst). Catilina u. die Parteikämpfe in Rom der J. 66–63. Abhandlung. gr. 8, 178 S. Dorpat, *Karow in Comm.* n. 3.60.

Stoll (H. H.) Anthologie griechischer Lyriker. 2 Abtlg. Melische u. chorische Lieder u. Idyllen. 5 Aufl. gr. 8, iv, 200 S. Halle, *Gesenius*. n. 2.25.

Studien, indische. Beiträge f. die Kunde d. ind. Alterthums. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Alb. Weber. 16 Bd. gr. 8, 480 S. Leipzig, *Bruckhaus*. n. 15.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. G. Curtius, L. Lange, O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius. 6 Bd. 1 Hft. gr. 8, 192 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. n. 4.50.

Thiemann (C.) Wörterbuch zu Xenophons Hellenika m. besond. Rücksicht auf Sprachgebrauch u. Phraseologie. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. gr. 8, iv, 112 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.50.

Thiisfridi Epternacensis vita Willibrordi metrica. Ed. Konr. Rossberg. 8, xxvii, 128 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.80.

Tobler (Adf.) Die altvenezianische Übersetzung der Sprüche d. Dionysius Cato. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4, 87 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 3.50.

Untersuchungen, philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 6 Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 3. (1–6, n. 23.40.) Inhalt: Analecta Eratosthenica. Scripsit Ernst Maas. 153 S.

Urlichs (L. v.) Pergamenische Inschriften. 16 Programm d. v. Wagnerschen Kunstinstitutes. gr. 8, 31 S. Würzburg, *Stahel in Comm.* n. —80.

Verhandlungen der 36 Versammlung deutscher Philologen u. Schulmänner in Karlsruhe vom 27 bis 30 Septbr., 1882. Mit 2 lith. Taf. gr. 4, iv, 334 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 12.

Wagner (Jos.) Zur Athetese d. Dialogs Euthyphron. gr. 8, 46 S. Brunn, 1882, *Winkler*. n. 1.

Wassner (Jul.) De heroum apud Graecos cultu. Diss. gr. 8, 53 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. n. 1.60.

Weise (Paul.) De Bacchidum Plautinae retractatione quae fertur. Diss. gr. 8, 62 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.20.

Wex (Jos.) Die Metra der alten Griechen u. Römer, im Umriss erklärt u. übersichtlich dargestellt. 2 Bearbeitg. gr. 8, iv, 94 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.50.

Xenophontis institutio Cyri, rec. et praefatus est Arnoldus Hug. Ed. maior. 8, c, 344 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 1.50.

Zierner (Herm.) Junggrammatische Streifzüge im Gebiete der Syntax. In Abschnitten. 2 Aufl. gr. 8, x, 158 S. Kolberg, *Post*. n. 2.70.

## ITALIAN.

Bencivenni (J.) Questioni ardenti di riforma scolastica. Torino, 1883. 8vo. 4m. 80.

Cima (Ant.) Breve teoria dello stilo latino. Torino, 1883. 8vo, viii, 135 pp. 1m. 80.

Fanfani (Pt.) e Frizzi (Gius.) Nuovo Vocabolario metodico della lingua italiana. Parte 1. Vocabolario domestico. Milano, 1883. 8vo, viii, 874 pp. 6m.

Massaroli (Gius.) Phul e Tuklapalasar II, Salmanasar V e Sargon. Roma, 1882. 8vo. 2m. 50.

## SPANISH.

Conto (C.) Apuntaciones sobre la lengua inglese. Madrid, 1883. 4to, 342 pp. 14m. 40.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Altfranzösische Bibliothek, herausg. von Dr. Wendelin Förster. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883.

— 2ter Bd. Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem, ein altfranzösisches Heldengedicht, herausg. von E. Koschwitz. 4m. 40pf.

— 6ter Bd. Das altfranzösische Rolandslied. Text von Chateauroux, nach Venedig VIII, herausg. von Wendelin Förster. 10m.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Classical Series, Vol. I, Part IV. Bentley's Plautine Emendations, by E. A. Sonnenschein.

Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburgh. With Text and Glossary on the basis of M. Heyne, edited, corrected, and enlarged. By James A. Harrison and Robert Sharp. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1883.

Copp (H. N.) United States Salary List and the Civil Service Law. Washington, D. C., 1883. 35c.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18 und 19 Jahrh. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883.

— 8. Frankfurter Gelehrte Anzeigen vom Jahre 1772. 3.80.

— 12. Vier kritische Gedichte, von J. J. Bodmer. 1.20.

ἐγχειρίδια et παραξιφίδας. *Est qui 'Memoriales' titulum fecerit, est qui πραγματικά et πάρεργα et διδασκαλικά, est item qui 'Historiae Naturalis,' est praeterea qui 'Pratum,' et itidem qui πάγκαρπον, est qui τόπων scripsit. Sunt item multi qui 'Coniectanea,' neque item non sunt qui indices libris suis fecerint aut 'Epistularum Moralium' aut 'Epistularum quaestionum' aut 'Confusarum' et quaedam alia inscripta nimis lepida multasque prorsus concinnitates redolentia.* The authors of some of these works are known. The Ἀμαλθείας κέρας or *Cornu Copiae* was by Sotion, the *Antiquae Lectiones* by Caesellius Vindex, the *Historia Naturalis* by Pliny, the *Pratum* by Suetonius, the Πανδέκται by Tullius Tiro. The reference to a *Silvae* may possibly be explained as an allusion to the *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui* by Valerius Probus: possibly Ἀνθηρά may be the *Florida* of Apuleius. *Epistulae Quaestiones* was the title of a work by Varro, thrice quoted by Gellius (*Noctes Atticae*, 14, 8, 2); *Quaestiones Confusae* was the name given to his miscellaneous collections by Julius Modestus; a book of *Coniectanea* was written by Ateius Capito.

The gentile name of Aulus Gellius shows that he belonged to a very old Italian family. All that is known of his life and career may be briefly put together from his *Noctes Atticae*. He nowhere mentions his birthplace, but he was at Rome when he assumed the *toga virilis* in his sixteenth or seventeenth year (18, 4, 1). The date of his birth is only a matter of approximate inference. His residence as a student at Athens fell after the consulship of Herodes Atticus (143 B. C.), for Atticus is spoken of as *consularis vir* at the time (*Noctes Atticae*, 19, 12; 1, 2, 1). Gellius calls himself *iuuenis* while at Athens (15, 2, 3, and elsewhere): a term which it is surely unnecessary, with Teuffel, to press so far as to make it imply that Gellius was a man of thirty or so in these student years. Supposing him to have resided at Athens from the age of nineteen to that of twenty-three, he must have been born A. D. 123 or thereabouts.

The ordinary educational course in his day began with grammar, and passed through rhetoric to philosophy (10, 19, 1, *adulescentem a rhetoribus et a facundiae studio ad disciplinas philosophiae transgressum*). In grammar he attended, among other lectures, those of the learned Carthaginian scholar Sulpicius Apollinaris, also the master of the emperor Pertinax.<sup>1</sup> In rhetoric one of his favorite

<sup>1</sup> 7, 6, 12, *quem in primis sectabar*; comp. 20, 6, 1, *cum cum Romae adulescentulus sectarer*.



teachers was Antonius Julianus, described (19, 9, 2) as *docendis publice iuvenibus magister*, in whose company he seems to have spent many pleasant hours (9, 15). Another was Titus Castricius, a man *gravi atque firmo iudicio* (11, 13, 1), the chief professor of rhetoric in Rome.<sup>1</sup> Gellius also heard Fronto in Rome during his early youth.<sup>2</sup>

In philosophy his tutors were mainly Favorinus and Calvisius Taurus—Calvisius Taurus he heard at Athens, whither he went from Rome after finishing his course of rhetoric,<sup>3</sup> and appears, though to what extent is uncertain, to have studied Aristotle and Plato with him.<sup>4</sup>

Gellius also saw a great deal at Athens of the enigmatical philosopher Peregrinus, surnamed or nicknamed Proteus, of whom he gives a very different account from that of Lucian.<sup>5</sup> Had the eighth book of the *Noctes Atticae* survived we might have heard more of this interesting personage, who figured in the dialogue of the third chapter. During the same time he saw and heard the celebrated rhetorician Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes.<sup>6</sup>

There are several pleasant allusions, scattered up and down the *Noctes Atticae*, to Gellius's student life at Athens; to his boating-trips to Aegina and back (2, 21, 1); his excursion to Delphi (12, 5, 1); the monthly gatherings of students (15, 2, 3, *in conviviiis iuvenum, quae agitare Athenis hebdomadibus lunae sollemne nobis fuit.*)

It was after his return from Athens to Rome that Gellius became intimate with Favorinus,<sup>7</sup> and thus fell under a philosophical influ-

<sup>1</sup> 13, 22, 1, *rhetoricae disciplinae doctor, qui habuit Romae locum principem declamandi ac docendi, summa vir auctoritate gravitateque et a divo Hadriano in mores atque litteras spectatus.*

<sup>2</sup> 19, 8, 1, *adulescentulus Romae, priusquam Athenas concederem.*

<sup>3</sup> 17, 8, 1, *Philosophus Taurus accipiebat nos Athenis. 7, 13, 1, factitatum observatumque hoc Athenis est ab his qui erant philosopho Tauro iunctiores. 19, 6, 2, hoc ego Athenis cum Tauro nostro legissem.*

<sup>4</sup> 7, 10, 1, *Taurus, vir memoria nostra in disciplina Platonica celebratus. 17, 20, 1, Symposium Platonis apud philosophum Taurum legebatur. 19, 6, 2, problemata Aristotelis.*

<sup>5</sup> 12, 11, 1, *Philosophum nomine Peregrinum, cui postea cognomen Proteus factum est, virum gravem atque constantem, vidimus, cum apud Athenas essemus, deversantem in quodam tugurio extra urbem. Cumque ad eum frequenter ventitarem, multa hercle dicere eum utiliter et honeste audivimus.*

<sup>6</sup> 19, 12; comp. 1, 2, 1.

<sup>7</sup> 14, 1, 1, *Audivimus quendam Favorinum philosophum Romae Graece disserentem egregia atque inlustri oratione. 1, 21, 4, cum Favorino Hygini commentarium*



ence which extended at least beyond the time at which he entered upon professional life.<sup>1</sup> If we may trust the impression left by the *Noctes Atticae*, Favorinus was not merely a technical metaphysician, but also an acute and learned scholar. As is well known, he was the author of works entitled ἀπομνημονεύματα and παντοδαπή ἱστορία, the latter of which most probably suggested the form, if indeed it did not supply much of the contents, of the *Noctes Atticae*.

Once returned to Rome, Gellius seems to have entered upon active life, of what kind he does not tell us explicitly; but he was, *homo adulescens* as he says (14, 2, 1), chosen a judge for the decision of private causes. He can hardly have been older than 25 at this time.<sup>2</sup> In one other passage (12, 13, 1) he alludes to his undertaking judicial functions; but in other places his accounts of his life are somewhat vague, though they refer generally to a legal career.<sup>3</sup> There is no mention of elevation to any high office; perhaps the mediocrity which stamps his literary work may have been also obvious in the discharge of his judicial functions.

I now come to the most important and difficult part of my task, which is to give some account, and attempt some analysis, of the *Noctes Atticae*. It appears from the author's preface that before he published this work in its final shape he had laid the foundation for it in a number of excerpts. Praef. 2; *usi autem sumus ordine rerum fortuito, quem antea in excerpendo feceramus. Nam proinde ut librum quemque in manus ceperam seu Graecum seu Latinum, vel quid memoratu dignum audieram, ita, quae libitum erat, cuius cunque generis erant, indistincte atque promisce adnotabam, eaque mihi ad subsidium memoriae quasi quoddam litterarum penus recondebam, etc.*

*egissem.* 10, 12, 9, *Favorinus philosophus, memoriarum veterum exquentissimus.* 16, 3, 1, *cum Favorino dies plerumque totos eramus, tenebatque animos nostros homo ille fandi dulcissimus, atque cum, quoquo iret, quasi lingua eius prorsus capti prosequeremur.*

<sup>1</sup> 14, 2, 1, 11, *quo primum tempore a praetoribus lectus in iudices essem . . . a subselliis pergo ad Favorinum philosophum, quem in eo tempore Romae plurimum sectabar.* Comp. 2, 22, 1; 17, 10, 1; 18, 1, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Digest 42, 1, 571, *Quidam consulebat, an valeret sententia a minore viginti quinque annis iudice data.* 50, 4, 8, *ad rem publicam administrandam ante vicessimum quintum annum, vel ad munera quae non patrimonii sunt vel honores, admitti minores non oportet.*

<sup>3</sup> 12, 13, 1, *cum Romae a consulibus iudex extra ordinem datus . . . pronuntiare iussus sum.* 13, 13, 1, *cum ex angulis secretisque librorum ac magistrorum in medium iam hominum et in lucem fori prodissem.* 11, 3, 1, *quando ab arbitris negotiisque otium est.* 16, 10, 1, *otium erat quodam die Romae in foro a negotiis.* Praef. 12, *per omnia semper negotiorum intervalla.*

The title *Noctes Atticae* was given to the book simply as a record of the fact that Gellius began to make his collections during the long winter evenings of his student years at Athens. It is professedly a handbook of miscellaneous information, but aims, as its author expressly says, at being comparatively popular, and regards quality more than quantity in the facts presented. For the presence of some few specimens of recondite learning the author thinks it necessary to apologize.<sup>1</sup>

Gellius does not tell us what is sufficiently obvious to a reader of his book, that he has taken great pains to enliven his lessons by the form in which his scraps of information are presented. Often indeed an extract is simply copied from an older author, and given in its naked simplicity without introduction or citation of authority; but quite as often an attempt is made to set it in the frame of an imaginary dialogue, a description, or an anecdote. The uniformity of the devices employed is amusing. Certain individuals, as Favonius, Fronto, Castricius, Calvisius Taurus, Sulpicius Apollinaris, figure as the interlocutors in the dialogue; but it is hardly to be supposed that the scenes into which they are introduced are other than fictitious. They may, of course, be taken as giving a general idea of the life of Gellius, his pursuits, and the sphere in which he moved; but they are, in all probability, no more historical than the introductory scenes of Plato's or Cicero's dialogues. As a foil to the instructed scholar or philosopher there often appears a conceited or affected or generally unseasonable individual<sup>2</sup> whose delusions are exposed by the light of superior wisdom. Sometimes the devil's advocate appears in another shape, as in 19. 1, 7, where a rich Asiatic Greek is disagreeable enough, on a sea-voyage, to ask a Stoic philosopher who has shown signs of alarm at a tempest, to explain to him how it is that he has been pale and trembling all the while, while the speaker has given no indication of fear.

<sup>1</sup> Praef. 11, 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup> 1, 2, 3, *adulescens philosophiae sectator . . . sed loquacior impendio et promptior*. 1, 10, 1, *adulescenti veterum verborum cupidissimo*. 4, 1, 1, *ostentabat quispiam grammaticae rei ditior scholica quaedam nugalia*. 5, 21, 4, *reprehensor audaculus verborum*. 6, 17, 1, 6, *grammaticum primae . . . celebritatis, . . . insolentis hominis inscitiam*. 7, 16, 1, *eiusmodi quispiam, qui tumultuariis et inconditis linguae exercitationibus ad famam sese facundiae promiserat*. 8, 10, *grammaticus quidam praestigiosus*. *ib.* 14, *intempestivus quidam de ambiguitate verborum disserens*. 9, 15, 1, *introit adulescens et praefatur arrogantius et elatius*. 11, 7, 3, *vetus celebratusque homo in causis, sed repentina et quasi tumultuaria doctrina praeditus*. 18, 4, 1 *iactator quispiam et venditator Sallustianae lectionis*. 20, 10, 2, *ille me despiciens*.

Were these loquacious or ignorant or conceited individuals to be taken seriously, we should have reason to hold up our hands in horror at the social condition of the second century A. D.; but they are in all probability mere men of straw. In any case they are tedious enough; nor is their constant introduction the only instance of want of skill shown in the composition of the *Noctes Atticae*.

Sometimes, as Mercklin and Kretzschmer<sup>1</sup> have pointed out, the form of the dialogue is not consistently maintained through a whole chapter; thus in 1, 7 Gellius starts by quoting a passage from Cicero's fifth speech against Verres; no indication of time or place is given, yet in §3 the writer proceeds *videbatur compluribus in extremo verbo menda esse*, and in §4 *aderat forte amicus noster*. In 2, 22 an elaborate account of the winds is put into the mouth of Favorinus; the dialogue is continued to the end of §26, yet in §30 Gellius quotes something which he has already attributed to Favorinus as if he had said it himself. There is a similar awkwardness at the end of 5, 21, where an opinion of Sennius Capito, having been originally introduced in the course of a supposed dialogue, is treated as if it had been cited by Gellius. In 13, 21, 9 it is quite clear that the passage discussed by Gellius had really been treated by Probus in the work from which the first part of the chapter is quoted, and this fact is enough to raise a suspicion that the anecdote about Probus is mere padding. A similar remark applies to the end of 19, 8, where there is no real distinction between the observations offered by Gellius himself and those previously put into the mouth of Fronto.

There are other marks of carelessness in composition. Gellius is apt, for instance, to introduce one of his interlocutors twice over, thus Herodes Atticus is described (1, 2) as *vir et Graeca facundia et consulari honore praeditus*, and so 9, 2 *Herodem Atticum, consularem virum ingenioque amoeno et Graeca facundia celebrem*.

Annianus (1, 4, 1), *rhetor perquam fuit honesti atque ii; doctrina quoque ista utiliore (subtiliore, Madvig) veterumque elegantiarum cura et memoria multa cripta omnia tam curiose spectabat, etc.* 19, 9, 1 *Annis rhetor, docendis publice iuvenibus magister, Hispano ue homo facundiae et rerum litterarumque veterum is Castricius, 11, 13, 1, disciplinae rhetoricae doctor, irmo iudicio vir.* 13, 22, *rhetoricae disciplinae doctor,*

Mercklin and Kretzschmer are quoted, the reference is to the 11th, in the *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Suppl. III 1st ed. of Kretzschmer, *De Auli Gellii fontibus*, Greifswald, 1860.

*qui habuit Romae locum principem declamandi ac docendi, summa vir auctoritate gravitateque.* Apion, 5, 14, *qui Πλειστονείκης appellatus est, litteris homo multis praeditus rerumque Graecarum plurima atque varia scientia fuit.* 7, 8, 1, *Graecus homo qui Πλειστονείκης appellatus est, facili atque alacri facundia fuit.* Tullius Tiro, 6, 3, 8, *M. Ciceronis libertus, sane quidem fuit ingenio homo eleganti et haudquaquam rerum litterarumque veterum indoctus, eoque ab ineunte aetate liberaliter instituto adminiculatore et quasi administro in studiis litterarum Cicero usus est.* 13, 9, 1, *Tullius Tiro, M. Ciceronis alumnus et libertus adiutorque in litteris studiorum eius fuit.*

An extract is sometimes so carelessly torn from its context that marks of the rent are still visible. Thus the epitome of 3, 17 begins *id quoque esse a gravissimus viris memoriae mandatum*, where there is nothing in the previous chapter to lead up to the *quoque*. Exactly in the same way 10, 8, 1, *fuit haec quoque antiquitus militaris animadversio.* 12, 12, 1, *haec quoque disciplina rhetorica (? disciplinae rhetoricae ?) est.* 18, 12, 1, *id quoque habitum est in oratione facienda elegantiae genus.*

Sometimes Gellius alludes or seems to allude to things which he has nowhere said, or proposes discussions which are nowhere started: thus 2, 22, 31, *considerandum igitur est quid sit secundo sole*, a question which is not treated anywhere else; and so it is with 12, 14, 7, *censuimus igitur amplius quaerendum.* 13, 7, 6, *in quibus, quod super ipsa re scriptum invenerimus, cum ipsius Aristotelis verbis in his commentariis scribemus.* 14, 7, 13, *de hac omni re alio in loco plenius accuratiusque nos memini scribere* (a discussion on the forms of the *senatus consultum*, which occurs nowhere else, not even in the epitomes of the eighth book). 18, 4, 11, *quos notavi et intulisse iam me aliquo in loco commentationibus istis existimo.*

It should further be observed that the same point is sometimes treated twice in much the same words: compare 2, 26, 9; 3, 9, 9, *palmae termes ex arbore cum fructu evulsus 'spadix' dicitur: σπάδικα δωρισί vocant avulsum e palma termitem cum fructu.* 3, 16, §§18-19, 15, 5, 5, *adfecta . . . ea proprie dicebantur quae non ad finem ipsum sed proxime finem progressa deductave erant. Hoc verbum ad hanc sententiam Cicero in hac fecit quam dixit de provinciis consularibus.* The same quotation, with others, is given in 15, 5, 5.

We may now approach the central question, from what authors and from what works does Gellius mainly derive his information?



In 17, 15 Gellius borrows his whole account of the two kinds of hellebore from Pliny 25, 47 foll. But Pliny's name is not mentioned until the sixth section, and then only in such a way as to put the reader off the scent. The two following chapters, however, which contain stories of Mithridates and his knowledge of medicine and of languages, although they may be found in Pliny (25, 6 ; 29, 24) in a shorter form, contain some information which is absent from his text, and must therefore be taken from some common authority, perhaps the memoirs of Pompeius Lenaeus.

The instance of 17, 15 will serve as a specimen of what we must look for throughout the whole of the *Noctes Atticae*. Gellius often alludes to his authority, but gives the false impression that only a part of the chapter in which it is mentioned is borrowed from him.

It sometimes, to all appearance, happens that Gellius makes extracts from more than one work in the same chapter. At the end of 3, 9, for instance, after speaking of some proverbial expressions, he goes out of his way to inform us that *spadix* and *poeniceus* mean one and the same thing ; at the end of 9, 1 there is a remark of a lexicographical character on the word *defendo* ; so at the end of 10, 3 on *Bruttiani*, of 13, 11 on *bellaria*, of 13, 22 on *crepidarius*, of 20, 5 on *cognobilis*. Mercklin thinks the same was the case in other places.

Perhaps the best way of getting an approximate idea of the character of the works consulted by Gellius will be to analyse his whole book according to the subjects of which it treats. In this way we shall obtain a *conspectus* of its general scope, and shall also be able to establish a visible connection, not only between some neighboring chapters, but between distant parts of the *Noctes Atticae*. This connection is sometimes so close as to lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the kindred sections belong to the same original work.

The *Noctes Atticae* is a work of such miscellaneous contents that it is impossible to make an entirely satisfactory table of them. A margin of unclassified matter must remain, whatever principle of arrangement be adopted. A rough distribution of the main bulk into certain great divisions is however possible. We may take as the first branch that of philosophy, understanding that term to include metaphysics, psychology, logic, and morals.

The true as distinguished from the false study of philosophy is touched upon briefly in 1, 2, and 10, 22 ; but there is nothing in these chapters which should lead us to connect them. 5, 15. *cor-*

*pusne sit vox an ἀσώματον, varias esse philosophorum sententias*, is evidently from the same source as the following chapter, *de vi oculorum deque videndi rationibus*. The authority is at least as late as the Ciceronian age, and almost certainly Latin, as Lucretius and Ennius are quoted. The first and second chapters of the seventh book, in which the opinions of Chrysippus on Providence and on Fate are discussed, are no less obviously akin, and probably from the same source; which, if we may press the fact that Cicero is quoted at the end of the second chapter, was presumably a late one. The first chapter of the fourteenth book, *dissertatio Favorini philosophi adversus eos qui Chaldaei appellantur et ex coetu motibusque siderum et stellarum fata hominum dicturos pollicentur*, deals with a cognate subject.

Turning to ethics, we find a discussion as to the nature of the *summum bonum* between a Stoic and Peripatetic in the first chapter of the eighteenth book; the doctrine of Chrysippus *περὶ καλοῦ καὶ ἡδονῆς* as applied to the character of justice is expounded in 14, 4. Connected in subject with the latter is 9, 5, in which various philosophical views of pleasure, concluding with that of the Stoic Hierocles, are presented. Three chapters on the relation of reason to passion (1, 26; 12, 5; 19, 1) are closely connected, and may come from the same manual (a very late one), or set of lectures. The first, on anger, purports to be from Taurus and Plutarch; the second, which is also professedly from Taurus, deals with the Stoic theory of bearing pain; the third gives the opinion of Epictetus on the subject of fear. We may mention in this connection the discourse of Herodes Atticus against *ἀπάθεια* (19, 12).

The following chapters touch on various points of logic: 11, 12 (Chrysippus on ambiguous terms); 15, 26 (a proposed Latin translation of Aristotle's definition of a syllogism); 16, 8 (Latin equivalents for several Greek technical terms); 5, 10, 11 (the argument called *ἀντιστρέφον*, again treated in 9, 16); 18, 13 (a story of a fallacy tried unsuccessfully upon Diogenes). Of these 16, 8 deserves the most attention; I am tempted to think that it comes from Varro, whether from the lost twenty-fourth book of the *de Lingua Latina*, quoted in the fourth section, or from the *Disciplinae*.

The eighth and ninth chapters of the second book are from Plutarch; the second, fourth, fifth and sixth of the nineteenth book from the *Problemata* of Aristotle, though in the fifth chapter the debt is not quite directly acknowledged.

The ninth chapter of the first book, the eleventh of the fourth, and the fifth of the eleventh, touch on points connected with the history of philosophy: the first two treating of the Pythagorean discipline; the last, of the difference between Pyrrhonists and Academics.

We may now pass on to another head, that of ethical principles applied. Here some sort of classification is possible, though there are hardly any *data* for inference as to authorities. Four chapters (9, 2; 12, 11; 13, 8; 13, 24) treat of the relation of philosophy to conduct; of these, one (12, 11) contains a *dictum* of Peregrinus, *virum sapientem non peccaturum esse, etiamsi peccasse eum di atque homines ignoraturi forent*; the other three are protests lodged in various forms against dilettantism and hypocrisy in the philosophical profession. Two of these (13, 8; 13, 24) have a distinctly Roman tinge.

Four chapters are devoted to questions of casuistry. In 1, 3 Favorinus, quoting Theophrastus and Cicero, starts the problem *an pro utilitate amicorum delinquendum aliquando sit*. The second and third (1, 13 and 2, 7) open in very much the same way, *in officiis capiendis, censendis, iudicandisque, quae καθήκοντα philosophi appellant, quaeri solet, etc.* *Quaeri solitum est in philosophorum disceptationibus, an semper, etc.* Does this fact point to identity of source? The first discusses the question whether the letter or the spirit of an order is to be taken as the more important; the second, how far a parent's commands are to be taken as binding. Both questions are approached from a Roman point of view. The remaining casuistical chapter is 14, 2, where Gellius consults Favorinus *de officio iudicis*.

A number of exhortations to particular virtues and warnings against particular vices should be mentioned here. 1, 17 (from Varro), *de tollendis vitiis uxoris*. 2, 12, Solon's law enforcing the duty of taking a part in political dissensions, and Favorinus's view about a similar duty in private life. 12, 1, *Favorinus suadet nobili feminae uti liberos quos peperisset non nutricum aliarum sed suo sibi lacte aleret*. 13, 28, Panaetius *de cavendis iniuriis*. 17, 19, Epictetus (quoted by Favorinus) ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου. 1, 15, Favorinus against the vice of loquacity. 6, 16; 15, 19, Varro (περὶ ἰδεσμάτων) against luxury. 9, 8 (Favorinus), *qui multa habet, multis eget*. 15, 8, an ancient orator *de cenarum atque luxuriae opprobatione*. 7, 11 (Metellus Numidicus), *cum inquinatissimis hominibus non esse convicio decertandum*. 8, 6 (Taurus, from Theophrastus and



Cicero), *cum post offensiunculas in gratiam redeatur, expostulationes fieri mutuas minime utile esse.* 10, 19 (Taurus), *non purgari neque levare peccatum cum praelenditur peccatorum, quae alii quoque peccaverunt, similitudo.*

A transition is natural from the last head to the *exempla* or remarkable instances of praiseworthy conduct cited in the *Noctes Atticae*. Among these two only are from Greek history, the story of the habits of Socrates put into the mouth of Favorinus (2, 1), and that told by Taurus (7, 10) about the youth of Euclides. The rest are Roman, and are as follows: 1, 14, the story of Fabricius and the Samnites; 2, 2, the two Fabii, father and son; 4, 8, Fabricius Luscinus and the avaricious Rufinus; 6, 18, the sanctity of oaths among the ancient Romans; 6, 19, Ti. Gracchus and Scipio Asiaticus; 7, 8, Scipio's continence; 7, 9, Cn. Flavius the *scriba*; 12, 4, Ennius's character as sketched by himself; 12, 8, the reconciliation of P. Scipio and Ti. Gracchus; 15, 12, C. Gracchus on his own quaestorship.

Of the authorities for some of these stories something certain may be said, at least on the negative side. Gellius has not borrowed anything from Valerius Maximus, natural as it would seem that he should have done so. In 12, 7, §8, after relating the story of Cn. Dolabella and the woman who was brought before him at Smyrna on the charge of poisoning her son and husband, he says *scripta haec historia est in libro Valeri Maximi factorum et dictorum memorabilium octavo*. Yet any careful reader of Gellius's narrative must see that although he has read Valerius Maximus (8, 1, 2 damn.), he has not copied him, for he adds two details about which Valerius is silent: *venenis clam datis*, of the one murder; *exceptum insidiis*, of the other. Again, let us compare Gellius 1, 14 with Valerius Maximus 4, 3, 6. The story (of C. Fabricius and the Samnite envoys) is told by Gellius in a far fuller and more characteristic manner than by Valerius. Gellius professes to take it from Hyginus, *de vita rebusque illustrium virorum*, which was probably the common authority for both writers. Both writers again have a story about Fabricius Luscinus and Cornelius Rufinus (Gellius 4, 8, Valerius Maximus 2, 9, 4) which occurs in a different context in Gellius from that in which it is set by Maximus. The style of Gellius's narrative in this case tempts me to suppose that it is from the hand of a classical writer, such as Hyginus or Nepos. The work of Nepos called *exempla* is quoted explicitly by Gellius when, in the eighteenth chapter of his sixth book, he is narrating

the history of the ten captives who returned to Rome after Cannae; indeed it is not impossible that the whole of the chapter comes from this work. The same may be the case with the story in the following chapter about Ti. Gracchus and Scipio Asiaticus, which is given in an abridged form by Valerius Maximus (4, 1, 8). For Gellius begins by saying *pulchrum atque liberale atque magnanimum factum Ti. Sempronii Gracchi in exemplis repositum est*. The story of Scipio's continence (7, 8) is apparently drawn from an older source than the version given by Valerius Maximus (4, 3, 1). The relation between the two writers is, I think, the same with regard to the two narratives given by Gellius 12, 8, and Valerius Maximus 4, 2, 3; 4, 2, 1.<sup>1</sup> Thus in six instances it is highly probable that Gellius follows an authority older than Valerius Maximus; in one of them he expressly cites Hyginus, in another Nepos; and it is therefore not rash to infer that he is indebted to these two writers for a considerable part of his information under the head which we have been discussing.

Five chapters of the *Noctes Atticae* are devoted to natural philosophy; these are 2, 22, on the winds; 2, 26, on the names of colors; 2, 30, on the effect of different winds on the motion of the waves; 9, 1, on the direction of blows as influencing their strength. Of these, chapters 2, 22 and 2, 30 must be derived from the same sources as the corresponding passages in Pliny (2, 126 foll.)

There are also four chapters on points of human pathology; 3, 16 (*temporis varietas in puerperis mulierum*), partly from Varro. 4, 19, again from Varro, *de moderando victu puerorum inpubium*. 17, 11, from Plutarch, *de habitu atque natura stomachi*. 18, 10, *errare istos, qui in exploranda febris venarum pulsus pertemplari putant, non arteriarum*.

The department of rhetoric is not very fully represented in the *Noctes Atticae*. The notes which fall under this head consist mainly of criticisms on passages in the ancient orators from Cato to Cicero, and exhibit a considerable similarity; but it is hardly possible to infer anything as to their source. Indeed it is not impossible that they come, as they profess to do, from the contemporaries of Gellius himself. We may notice as kindred in spirit

<sup>1</sup> Mercklin thinks that the story of Aemilius Lepidus and Fulvius Flaccus comes directly from Valerius Maximus. There seems, however, to be nothing in the language to necessitate such a conclusion, while of the preceding story about the older Africanus and Ti. Gracchus, Gellius gives a fuller, and therefore probably an older, version.

the remarks of Castricius upon Metellus Numidicus (1, 6), and the defence of Cato against the strictures of Tullius Tiro (6, 3). In both chapters the point insisted on is the difference between the manner suitable to an advocate and that suitable to a statesman. Perhaps we may also connect 12, 12 and 16, 2, which deal with the art of reply. Cicero is defended against captious criticism in 1, 4 and 17, 5. The remaining chapters do not admit of any classification; they are 9, 15 (a case of *ἀπορον* or *inexplicable*); 17, 12 (*materiae infames*); 17, 20 (a translation of a passage in Plato's *Symposium*).

If the contributions of Gellius to the art of rhetoric are scanty, the same cannot be said of the passages of ancient literary criticism which he has preserved. Twenty-eight chapters are devoted to this subject, some of which may be easily arranged together as containing similar matter. Nine are given to the question of translation or adaptation from Greek into Latin. These are 2, 23, where Caecilius is compared, much to his disadvantage, with Menander; 11, 4, a criticism of a translation from Euripides by Ennius. 2, 27, where Castricius is represented as contrasting Sallust's description of Sertorius with that of Philip by Demosthenes. 8, 8 and 17, 20, which touch upon Gellius's own efforts at rendering Plato. 9, 9; 13, 27; 17, 10, comparisons with the originals of Vergil's renderings or adaptations of Theocritus, Homer, Parthenius, and Pindar. 19, 11, a translation by a friend of Gellius of some erotic verses by Plato. It is natural to suppose that some of these criticisms are taken from a manual in which the whole question of translation was discussed. Such a work, in all probability, was the *ὁμοιότητες* of Octavius Avitus, mentioned by Suetonius in his life of Vergil.

1, 10 and 11, 7 contain protests against the affectation of antiquarianism in writing. General remarks on style will be found in 2, 5 (a short comparison between Plato and Lysias); 10, 3, where the styles of Gracchus and Cicero are contrasted; 16, 1 (the expression of the same thought by Cato and Musonius). 11, 13, and 14, which contain the praises of C. Gracchus and the historian L. Piso, seem to be intimately connected. Other chapters falling under this head are 15, 24 (the metrical criticism of Roman comedians by Volcatius Sedigitus); 6, 14, where Varro's distinction between the three styles (*uber*, *gracilis*, *mediocris*) is quoted; 18, 8 (Lucilius on *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*); and 12, 2 (Seneca upon Ennius and Cicero).

Three chapters (3, 1; 4, 15; 10, 26) are devoted to criticism,

mainly defensive, of Sallust, whose abrupt and antiquarian style appears to have attracted a great deal of attention on the part of scholars and literary men. Three again (5, 8; 9, 10; 10, 16) contain pleadings in defence of Vergil against strictures of Hyginus and Cornutus, taken possibly from the work of Asconius *contra obtrectatores Vergilii*. In 15, 6 attention is drawn to a mistake of Cicero's. Finally, 3, 3 deals (after Varro) with the question of the genuine and spurious plays of Plautus.

History and biography absorb thirty-six chapters. Among these we may fairly distinguish the following groups: (1) 1, 23; 9, 11, 13, on Roman *cognomina* (Praetextatus, Corvinus, and Torquatus). These notices are so similar in tone and composition as to suggest the inference that they come from the same source, which may have been perhaps the work of Cornelius Epicadus, Sulla's freedman, on *cognomina*. It should be observed that the twenty-third chapter of the first book is verbally identical with a passage in the first book of Macrobius's *Saturnalia* (1, 6, 18 foll.). It has been of course assumed that Macrobius borrowed from Gellius; but against this hypothesis it may be urged that Macrobius goes on to supplement the story about Praetextatus by further information respecting other *cognomina* unknown to Gellius, and this in such a natural and easy way as to lead us to suppose that the whole passage is taken from some book which dealt in a comprehensive way with the whole subject. We should probably have known more of this work and its contents had the last book of Nonius been preserved. (2) Six chapters (1, 24; 3, 3; 8, 15; 12, 4; 13, 2; 17, 14) are devoted to interesting passages in the lives of Latin poets. In one of these cases the relation between Gellius and Macrobius is precisely the same as that which has just been considered. I allude to the notice of Publilius Syrus, which is fuller in Macrobius 2, 7 than in Gellius 17, 14. Is Varro the authority for these fragments of biography? he is expressly quoted in 1, 24, and 3, 3. (3) Fragments of biographies of Greek poets are preserved 3, 11; 15, 20; 17, 4. The last of these comes ostensibly from the *Chronicon* of Apollodorus, but may well have been taken from Varro's adaptations from that work; for Varro is actually cited in 3, 11. (4) Another group of chapters (5, 3; 13, 5; 14, 3; 20, 5) deals with lives of Greek philosophers; while (5) a large number contains notes of remarkable facts from Roman history (1, 13 end; 2, 11; 3, 7, 8; 4, 14, 18; 7, 3, 4; 10, 27, 28; 15, 4, 11; 18, 22). We are here brought back to the question of



ac quo nomine a pontifice maximo capiatur, et quo statim iure esse incipiat simul atque capta est; quodque, ut Labeo dicit, nec intestato cuiquam nec eius intestatae quisquam iure heres est. 10, 15, de flaminis Dialis deque flaminicae caerimoniis; verbaque ex edicto praetoris apposita quibus dicit non coacturum se ad iurandum neque virgines Vestae neque Dialem; this chapter bears the names of Varro and Masurius Sabinus. 2, 28, apparently from Varro, non esse compertum cui deo rem divinam fieri oporteat, cum terra movet. (2) On social customs. 2, 15, quod antiquitus aetati senectae potissimum habili sunt ampli honores, et cur postea ad maritos et ad patres idem isti honores delati sint; the authority is uncertain, but not older than the *leges Iuliae*. 5, 13, de officiorum gradu atque ordine moribus populi Romani observato. This chapter quotes from Masurius Sabinus. 6, 4, cuiusmodi servos et quam ob causam Caelius Sabinus, iuris civilis auctor, pilleatos venum dari solitos scripserit. 6, 12, de tunicis chiridotis: quod earum usum P. Africanus Sulpicio Gallo obiecit. The authority for this chapter must be later than Vergil, who is quoted in it. 10, 23, de mulierum veterum victu et moribus; perhaps from Varro. 11, 6, in which Varro is quoted, quod mulieres Romae per Herculem non iuraverint neque viri per Castorem. (3) 4, 3, and 4, on points of the Roman marriage laws, from Servius Sulpicius de dotibus. (4) Notes on the powers of certain high officers: the censors, 4, 12, 20; 6, 22, the aediles and quaestors, 13, 12, and 13, mostly from Varro. 14, 7, de officio senatus habendi; 8, an praefectus Latinarum causa ius senatus convocandi consulendique habeat, both from Ateius Capito. (5) Questions of military antiquities. 5, 6, de coronis militaribus, partly at least from Masurius Sabinus. 10, 8, inter ignominias militares quibus milites exercebantur fuisse sanguinis dimissionem. 10, 9, quibus modis quoque habitu acies Romana instrui solita sit. 10, 25, telorum et iaculorum gladio-  
rumque, atque inibi navium quoque vocabula, quae scripta in veterum libris reperiuntur. This last chapter should be compared with the thirteenth and nineteenth books of Nonius and parts of the eighteenth and nineteenth of Isidore's *Origines*. The three accounts have the appearance of coming from a common authority, which was probably the *Pratum* of Suetonius. 16, 4, the ancient form of declaring war, and the military oath. This chapter has in §5 matter given also by Paulus, p. 112. (6) Extracts from the augur Messala's work de auspiciis, the pomerium, the minores and maiores magistratus; aliud esse contionem habere, aliud cum

*populo agere*; 13, 14; 15, 16. We should also mention the following chapters: 3, 2, on the Roman day, from Varro, supplemented by an early commentator on Vergil. This account is to be found in Macrobius Sat. 1, 3, continued and completed. 5, 19, quoting Masurius Sabinus, on adoption. 15, 27 (Laelius Felix from Labeo), on the *comitia*.

There are also four chapters on legal history: 2, 24, on the *leges sumptuariae*, from the *coniectanea* of Ateius Capito. 6, 15, and 11, 18, on *furtum*, from Antistius Labeo and Masurius Sabinus respectively; and 20, 1, professedly a dialogue between Caecilius and Favorinus on some passages in the twelve tables.

But Latin lexicography is the subject which absorbs most of the chapters that can be assigned to any single branch of learning. If I am not mistaken, more than one hundred chapters, about a quarter of the whole work, are devoted to it. Among these we may without difficulty distinguish five groups, which should perhaps be respectively assigned to different authorities. The first of these groups, embracing by far the largest part of the whole, contains articles of pure lexicography, as follows. 1, 16, on the use of *mille* in the singular, compare Festus, p. 153, *mille singulariter dicebant*. Macrobius has the same note (1, 5, 4 foll.)

1, 25, *indutiae*.

2, 4, *divinatio*. (Partly from Gavius Bassus *de origine vocabulorum*.)

2, 10, *favisae*. Compare Paulus, p. 88.

2, 16, *postumus*. Partly from Caesellius Vindex.

2, 19, *rescire*.

2, 21, *septem triones*. Compare Festus, p. 339.

3, 9, *equus Seianus, aurum Tolosanum*. From Gavius Bassus and Julius Modestus.

3, 16, §§18, 19, *adfectius*.

3, 18, *pedarii senatores*. Gavius Bassus is mentioned, but the bulk of the note may be from Verrius Flaccus, compare Festus, p. 210.

4, 1, *penus*. The latest authority quoted is Masurius Sabinus, but the word was treated by Verrius; see Festus, p. 250.

4, 6, *praecidaneus* and *succidaneus*. Compare Festus, pp. 218, 302.

4, 9, *religiosus*. Compare Festus, pp. 278, 289.

4, 12, *impositiae*. Compare Paulus, p. 108.

5, 12, *Veioris*. Compare Festus, p. 379, and for the note on *Lucetius*, Paulus, p. 114.

5, 17, *dies atri*. This note is avowedly from Verrius Flaccus, and so also the following one (5, 18) on *historia* and *annales*.

5, 21, *pluria, compluria, compluriens*. Compare Paulus, p. 59; the note, however, professes to come from Sennius Capito.

6, 4, *sub corona venire*. Compare Festus, p. 306, who quotes the same passage from Cato, so that the article, though taken directly from Caelius Sabinus, may ultimately come from Verrius Flaccus.

6, 13, *classicus, infra classem*. For the latter compare Paulus, p. 113, and for *classicus*, Paulus, p. 56, on *classici testes*.

6, 17, *obnoxius*.

7, 5, *purus putus*. From Verrius; see Festus, p. 217.

7, 16, *deprecor*.

8, 10, *halophanta*. Compare Paulus, p. 101.

8, 12, *plerique omnes*.

8, 13, *cupsones*.

8, 14, words from Naevius and Cn. Gellius.

9, 1, §8, *defendo*.

10, 3, §18, *Bruttiani*. Probably from Verrius; compare Paulus, p. 31.

10, 11, *maturus, praecox* (= Macrobius 6, 8, 7 foll.)

10, 13, *cum partim*.

10, 14, *contumelia mihi factum itur*.

10, 20, *lex, rogatio*, etc. For *privilegium* compare Paulus, p. 226.

10, 29, *atque, deque*.

11, 1, *Italia, multa*. For *Italia* compare Paulus, p. 106.

11, 2, *elegans*.

11, 3, *pro*. Compare Paulus, p. 228.

11, 7, *apluda, flocces, bovinator*. For *apluda* and *bovinator* compare Paulus, pp. 10, 30.

11, 11, *mentiri* and *mendacium dicere*. From Nigidius Figulus.

11, 17, *retare flumina*. Compare Festus, p. 273.

12, 10, *aeditumus*. Compare Paulus, p. 13.

12, 13, *intra Kalendas*.

12, 14, *saltem*.

13, 1, *fatum* and *natura*.

13, 11, §7, *bellaria*. Compare perhaps Paulus, p. 35.

13, 17, *humanitas*.

13, 18, *inter os atque offam*.

13, 22, §§7, 8, *gallicae, crepidarius*.

13, 23, *Nerio, Neriene*.



13, 25 (beginning), *manubiae*.

13, 29, *multi mortales*.

13, 30, *facies*.

13, 31, *caninum prandium*.

15, 30, *petorritum*. Compare Paulus, p. 207.

16, 5, *vestibulum*. The remarks on *vescus* closely resemble the note on this word in Paulus, p. 368.

16, 6, *bidens*. This note is either from Hyginus, as it professes to be, or from Verrius Flaccus; compare Paulus, p. 35.

16, 9, *susque deque*. The note on this phrase in Festus, p. 290, has nothing in common with this chapter.

16, 10, *proletarii, adsidui*. Compare Paulus, pp. 9, 226.

16, 13, *municipium* and *colonia*.

16, 14, *festinare* and *properare*. From Verrius Flaccus.

16, 16, *Agrippa*.

16, 17, *Vaticanus collis*. This and the preceding note are from Varro's *Rerum Divinarum*.

17, 6, *servus recepticius*. Suggested by a passage in the *de obscuris Catonis* of Verrius Flaccus.

17, 13, various meanings of *quin*.

18, 2, §12 foll., *verare*.

18, 7, *contio*. Avowedly from Verrius Flaccus.

18, 9, *inseco*. Ultimately, perhaps, from Verrius; compare Paulus, p. 111, s. v. *insece*.

19, 10, *praeter propter*.

19, 13, *nanus*. Compare Festus, p. 176.

20, 2, *siticines*. Professedly from Ateius Capito and Caesellius Vindex.

20, 3, *sicinnista*.

20, 5, §13, *cognobilis*.

20, 10, *ex iure manu consertum*.

20, 11, *scm'na*. From Lavinius *de verbis sordidis*.

A considerable number of these notes, it will have been observed, coincides to a greater or less extent with articles in Festus or Paulus, and may therefore with some probability be referred to Verrius Flaccus.

The second group of lexicographical notices contains remarks on the usages of particular authors.

12, 15, adverbs used by Sisenna.

17, 2, words found in the *avvales* of Claudius Quadrigarius.

19, 7, words used by Laevius.

17, 1, Cicero's use of *paenitere*.  
 10, 26, peculiar usages of Sallust.  
 15, 25; 20, 9, words invented by Matius.  
 16, 7, bold expressions of Laberius.  
 18, 11, expressions of Furius Antias, objected to by Caesellius Vindex.

2, 6; 7, 6; 8, 5, peculiarities in the diction of Vergil; defended against the attacks of Hyginus or Cornutus.

The Vergilian notes, as they are all defensive, may perhaps come from Asconius *contra obtrectatores Vergilii*. Some of the others may possibly be referred to Caesellius Vindex, who is mentioned in 18, 11.

The third group consists of remarks on words which had changed their meaning since the classical period.

1, 22, *superesse*.  
 2, 20, *vivaria*.  
 6, 11, *levitas* and *nequitia*.  
 8, 14, words used in unusual senses by Naevius and Cn. Gellius.  
 10, 21, *novissimus* and *novissime*.  
 13, 6, *barbarismus*.  
 15, 5, *profligare*.

The similarity of these articles tempts one to refer them to a separate work.

Fourthly, there are a few articles treating of differences of meaning between words apparently synonymous. These are

3, 12, *bibax* and *bibosus*. From the *commentarii grammatici* of Nigidius Figulus.

3, 14, *dimidium* and *dimidiatum*.

4, 2, *morbis* and *vitium*. The latest authority quoted is Caelius Sabinus.

13, 3, *necessitudo* and *necessitas*.

18, 4, *vanus* and *stolidus*. Ultimately, perhaps, from Nigidius.

18, 6, *matrona* and *mater familias*. Aelius Melissus corrected by a reference, in all probability, to Verrius Flaccus; compare Paulus, p. 125, s. v. *matrona* and *mater familias*.

Fifthly, three chapters deal with words of double meaning: 8, 14; 9, 12, *formidolosus*, *infestus*, *nescius*, etc., and adjectives used in both an active and a passive sense. Part of this note is from Nigidius. 12, 9, *periculum*, *venenum*, *contagium*, *honor*, all of which, it is observed, are used both in a good and a bad sense.

Etymology is represented by ten chapters: 1, 18, a discussion, started by a passage in Varro, on the derivation of *fur*; 3, 19, on

*parcus*, from Gavius Bassus *de origine verborum et vocabulorum*; 5, 7, from the same work, on *persona*; 7, 12, in which it is shown that *sacellum* is not a compound word; 10, 5, in which the same is shown (as against Nigidius) of *avarus*; 12, 3, on *licitor*, from Valgius and Tullius Tiro; 13, 9, on *hyades*, from Tiro and a later scholar; 13, 4, on *soror* and *frater*, the first from Antistius Labeo, probably quoting Nigidius; 15, 3, on *ausugio*, suggested by a passage in Cicero; 16, 12, suggested by Cloatius Verus, on some words supposed to be taken from the Greek.

Discussions on difficult points of Latin Grammar take up upwards of thirty chapters. 2, 3; 10, 4; 19, 14 treat of the pronunciation of particular letters, *h*, *v*, and some others. 10, 4 and 19, 14 are from the *commentarii* of Nigidius. Five deal with points of prosody; 2, 17 (the quantity of *in* and *con* in composition); 4, 7, from Probus, on the quantity of the oblique cases of Hannibal and Hasdrubal; 4, 17 (*ob* and *con* before compounds of *iacio*); 7, 15 (the second syllable of *quiesco*); 9, 6 (the first syllable of *actito*). Three touch on questions of accentuation: 6, 7; 13, 26; 17, 3, §5; two on unexpected uses of the singular and plural, 2, 13; 19, 8. Seven are on case-forms: 4, 16 on the genitive in *-uis* and dative in *-u* of the fourth declension; 9, 14, on the genitive singular of the fifth declension. In the latter chapter Caesellius Vindex is mentioned; the former may be from Pliny, who is quoted as the authority for the similar though much shorter statement of Charisius, p. 143 K. 8, 1 and 10, 24, on *noctu hesterna* and *die crastini*, form part of the same statement, as may easily be seen by a comparison of Macrobius 1, 4, 16 foll., who has the same instances differently arranged. Compare also Charisius, p. 207, and Nonius, p. 98. 10, 1 discusses the question whether *tertium* or *tertio* is the right form of the adverb, and bears the names of Varro and Tullius Tiro; 20, 6 asks whether *curam vestri* or *vestrum* is right. There are two chapters on points of gender, 6, 2, on the gender of *cor*, from Terentius Scaurus, and 15, 9, on that of *frons*. With the last note we may compare Festus, p. 286, where *recto fronte* is likewise quoted from Cato. Four are on verb-inflection: 6, 9, on the forms *memordi*, *spependi*, and *cecurri*, which bears the name of Probus, from whom it very probably comes; 15, 13 and 18, 12, on verbs used both in the active and passive form; probably either from Probus or Pliny;<sup>1</sup> 15, 15, on the perfect participle passive of *pando*.

<sup>1</sup> Priscian (1, p. 393 K) expressly mentions these scholars as having dealt with this subject. For a full discussion of the point I may refer to Conington's *Virgil*, Vol. 1 (4th edition), p. lxxi foll.

A syntactical question (*exigor portorium*) is touched upon in 15, 14.

A curious and interesting, though not a very large, section of the *Noctes Atticae* is that which deals with points of textual criticism. Two notices under this head are expressly said to be taken from Probus: 1, 15, §18, on *loquentia* and *eloquentia*, and 13, 21, on *urbes* and *urbis* in Vergil. Others are so similar to these in manner and treatment that it is natural to refer them to the same scholar. An appeal is constantly made to good manuscripts against bad; for instance, in 1, 7 to the Tironian recension of Cicero; in 1, 16, §15, and 9, 14, to good copies of Cicero; in 1, 21 and 9, 14, to an autograph copy of Vergil, or copies known to have been in his house; in 2, 14 and 10, 13 to good manuscripts of Cato; similarly to good copies in 5, 4 of Fabius Pictor, in 6, 20 of Catullus, in 9, 14; 20, 6 of Sallust, in 18, 5 of Ennius. Probus, as we know from his short memoir by Suetonius, gave an immense amount of attention to the collection of good manuscripts of classical authors. The notes just mentioned are very much what he might be supposed to have written, and are, moreover, marked, on the whole, by the same trenchant and positive style.

The remaining sections of the *Noctes Atticae* hardly admit of any logical arrangement. One set of chapters<sup>1</sup> may perhaps be noted as chronicling *mirabilia* or remarkable natural phenomena; another<sup>2</sup> consists of notes on remarkable events. A third group may, for want of a better expression, be said to contain *res memoria dignas*.<sup>3</sup> A fourth consists of anecdotes.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes the true authority is certainly given; in one case it is Sotion's *κέρας Ἀμαλθείας*, in another the *liber rerum memoria dignarum* of Verrius Flaccus; and these or similar works, such as the *παντοδαπή ιστορία* of Favorinus, may have been the sources of the whole.

The foregoing rough analysis is offered as an aid towards ascertaining the principles which underlie the apparent chaos of the *Noctes Atticae*, and the probable character and periods of the authorities from whom Gellius mostly derived his knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> 3, 6; 8, 4; 9, 4; 10, 2; 10, 12; 16, 15.

<sup>2</sup> 3, 15; 4, 5; 7, 17; 15, 10; 15, 16 (3, 15 and 15, 16 seem to come from some book on remarkable deaths; see Pliny 7, 180, where Verrius Flaccus is mentioned as having chronicled a good many).

<sup>3</sup> 1, 11; 4, 13; 5, 9; 5, 14; 6, 6; 6, 8; 9, 7; 10, 17; 12, 7; 13, 7; 15, 7; 16, 3; 16, 11; 16, 19; 17, 15; 17, 16; 17, 17; 20, 7; 20, 8.

<sup>4</sup> 1, 5; 1, 8; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 13; 3, 17; 5, 2; 5, 5; 6, 1; 6, 5; 8, 9; 8, 11; 9, 3; 10, 6; 10, 18; 11, 8; 11, 9-10; 12, 6; 13, 4; 15, 2; 15, 17; 15, 31.

13, 25 (beginning), *manubiae*.

13, 29, *multi mortales*.

13, 30, *facies*.

13, 31, *caninum prandium*.

15, 30, *petorritum*. Compare Paulus,

16, 5, *vestibulum*. The remarks on a note on this word in Paulus, p. 368.

16, 6, *bidens*. This note is either from Varro to be, or from Verrius Flaccus; compare

16, 9, *susque deque*. The note on this has nothing in common with this chapter.

16, 10, *proletarii, adsidui*. Compare

16, 13, *municipium* and *colonia*.

16, 14, *festinare* and *properare*.

16, 16, *Agrippa*.

16, 17, *Vaticanus collis*. This is from Varro's *Rerum Divinarum*.

17, 6, *servus recepticius*. See also *obscuris Catonis* of Verrius Flaccus.

17, 13, various meanings of

18, 2, §12 foll., *verare*.

18, 7, *contio*. Avowedly from

18, 9, *inseco*. Ultimate source, Paulus, p. 111, s. v. *insece*.

19, 10, *praeter propter*.

19, 13, *nanus*. Compare

20, 2, *siticines*. Professor Vindex.

20, 3, *sicinnista*.

20, 5, §13, *cognobilis*.

20, 10, *ex iure manu*

20, 11, *sculna*. From

A considerable number of these coincides to a great extent with Paulus, and may therefore be from Verrius Flaccus.

The second group of notes on the usages of prepositions

12, 15, adverbs

17, 2, words for

19, 7, words used

of the word *ad*; 16, 15, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 16, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 17, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 18, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 19, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 20, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 21, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 22, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 23, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 24, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 25, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 26, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 27, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 28, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 29, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 30, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 31, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 32, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 33, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 34, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 35, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 36, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 37, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 38, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 39, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 40, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 41, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 42, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 43, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 44, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 45, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 46, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 47, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 48, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 49, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 50, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 51, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 52, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 53, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 54, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 55, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 56, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 57, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 58, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 59, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 60, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 61, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 62, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 63, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 64, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 65, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 66, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 67, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 68, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 69, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 70, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 71, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 72, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 73, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 74, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 75, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 76, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 77, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 78, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 79, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 80, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 81, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 82, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 83, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 84, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 85, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 86, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 87, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 88, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 89, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 90, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 91, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 92, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 93, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 94, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 95, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 96, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 97, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 98, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 99, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 100, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 101, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 102, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 103, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 104, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 105, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 106, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 107, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 108, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 109, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 110, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 111, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 112, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 113, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 114, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 115, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 116, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 117, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 118, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 119, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 120, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 121, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 122, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 123, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 124, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 125, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 126, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 127, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 128, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 129, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 130, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 131, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 132, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 133, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 134, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 135, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 136, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 137, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 138, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 139, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 140, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 141, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 142, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 143, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 144, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 145, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 146, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 147, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 148, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 149, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 150, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 151, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 152, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 153, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 154, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 155, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 156, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 157, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 158, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 159, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 160, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 161, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 162, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 163, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 164, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 165, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 166, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 167, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 168, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 169, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 170, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 171, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 172, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 173, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 174, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 175, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 176, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 177, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 178, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 179, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 180, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 181, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 182, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 183, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 184, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 185, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 186, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 187, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 188, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 189, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 190, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 191, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 192, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 193, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 194, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 195, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 196, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 197, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 198, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 199, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 200, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 201, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 202, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 203, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 204, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 205, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 206, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 207, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 208, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 209, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 210, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 211, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 212, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 213, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 214, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 215, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 216, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 217, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 218, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 219, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 220, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 221, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 222, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 223, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 224, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 225, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 226, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 227, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 228, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 229, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 230, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 231, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 232, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 233, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 234, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 235, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 236, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 237, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 238, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 239, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 240, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 241, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 242, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 243, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 244, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 245, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 246, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 247, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 248, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 249, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 250, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 251, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 252, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 253, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 254, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 255, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 256, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 257, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 258, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 259, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 260, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 261, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 262, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 263, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 264, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 265, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 266, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 267, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 268, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 269, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 270, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 271, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 272, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 273, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 274, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 275, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 276, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 277, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 278, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 279, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 280, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 281, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 282, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 283, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 284, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 285, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 286, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 287, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 288, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 289, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 290, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 291, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 292, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 293, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 294, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 295, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 296, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 297, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 298, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 299, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 300, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 301, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 302, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 303, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 304, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 305, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 306, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 307, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 308, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 309, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 310, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 311, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 312, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 313, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 314, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 315, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 316, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 317, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 318, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 319, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 320, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 321, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 322, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 323, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 324, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 325, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 326, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 327, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 328, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 329, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 330, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 331, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 332, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 333, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 334, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 335, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 336, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 337, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 338, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 339, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 340, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 341, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 342, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 343, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 344, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 345, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 346, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 347, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 348, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 349, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 350, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 351, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 352, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 353, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 354, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 355, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 356, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 357, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 358, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 359, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 360, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 361, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 362, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 363, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 364, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 365, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 366, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 367, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 368, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 369, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 370, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 371, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 372, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 373, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 374, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 375, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 376, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 377, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 378, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 379, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 380, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 381, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 382, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 383, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 384, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 385, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 386, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 387, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 388, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 389, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 390, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 391, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 392, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 393, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 394, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 395, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 396, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 397, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 398, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 399, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 400, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 401, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 402, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 403, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 404, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 405, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 406, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 407, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 408, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 409, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 410, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 411, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 412, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 413, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 414, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 415, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 416, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 417, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 418, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 419, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 420, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 421, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 422, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 423, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 424, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 425, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 426, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 427, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 428, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 429, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 430, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 431, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 432, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 433, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 434, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 435, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 436, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 437, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 438, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 439, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 440, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 441, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 442, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 443, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 444, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 445, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 446, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 447, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 448, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 449, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 450, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 451, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 452, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 453, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 454, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 455, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 456, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 457, *ad* and *sub*; 16, 458, *ad* and *sub*;

... touched upon in  
 ... large, section of the  
 ... of textual criticism.  
 ... said to be taken from  
 ... *requentia*, and 13, 21, on  
 ... similar to these in manner  
 ... them to the same scholar.  
 ... manuscripts against bad ; for  
 ... sion of Cicero ; in 1, 16, §15,  
 ... ; in 1, 21 and 9, 14, to an auto-  
 ... own to have been in his house ;  
 ... scripts of Cato ; similarly to good  
 ... 6, 20 of Catullus, in 9, 14 ; 20, 6  
 ... Probus, as we know from his short  
 ... immense amount of attention to the  
 ... of classical authors. The notes just  
 ... what he might be supposed to have  
 ... r, marked, on the whole, by the same  
 ... le.

... of the *Noctes Atticae* hardly admit of  
 ... One set of chapters<sup>1</sup> may perhaps be  
 ... *mirabilia* or remarkable natural phenomena ;  
 ... notes on remarkable events. A third group  
 ... ter expression, be said to contain *res memoria*  
 ... consists of anecdotes.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes the true  
 ... y given ; in one case it is Sotion's *κέρας Ἀμαλθείας*,  
 ... *rerum memoria dignarum* of Verrius Flaccus ;  
 ... ar works, such as the *παντοδαπή ιστορία* of Favorinus,  
 ... the sources of the whole.  
 ... rough analysis is offered as an aid towards ascer-  
 ... principles which underlie the apparent chaos of the  
 ... *ae*, and the probable character and periods of the  
 ... from whom Gellius mostly derived his knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> 9, 4 ; 10, 2 ; 10, 12 ; 16, 15.

<sup>2</sup> 4, 5 ; 7, 17 ; 15, 10 ; 15, 16 (3, 15 and 15, 16 seem to come from some  
 ... remarkable deaths ; see Pliny 7, 180, where Verrius Flaccus is men-  
 ... having chronicled a good many).

<sup>3</sup> 1 ; 4, 13 ; 5, 9 ; 5, 14 ; 6, 6 ; 6, 8 ; 9, 7 ; 10, 17 ; 12, 7 ; 13, 7 ; 15, 7 ; 16,  
 11 ; 16, 19 ; 17, 15 ; 17, 16 ; 17, 17 ; 20, 7 ; 20, 8.

<sup>4</sup> 5 ; 1, 8 ; 3, 4 ; 3, 5 ; 3, 13 ; 3, 17 ; 5, 2 ; 5, 5 ; 6, 1 ; 6, 5 ; 8, 9 ; 8, 11 ; 9,  
 10, 6 ; 10, 18 ; 11, 8 ; 11, 9-10 ; 12, 6 ; 13, 4 ; 15, 2 ; 15, 17 ; 15, 31.

## II.—ON THE FINAL SENTENCE IN GREEK.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Schanz is moving steadily forward on the lines which are to converge, seven or eight years hence, in his Historical Syntax of the Greek Language from Homer to Aristotle. He has divided the preliminary work among the members of his Grammatical Society; and while the *Beiträge* will contain, from time to time, treatises on post-Aristotelian Greek, the main object is to work up the material for the period designated. We have already had a valuable and interesting paper by Keck, on the dual in the Greek orators, and a treatise on *πρίν* by Sturm, which was duly reviewed in this Journal (IV 89). The other subjects announced as already in hand are the development of the consecutive sentence, history of *οὐ μή*, origin and development of the substantive sentence, the temporal sentences with *ἕως*,<sup>2</sup> the *figura*

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache.* Herausg. v. M. Schanz. Heft 4, Band II. Heft I. Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze, von Dr. Philipp Weber. Erste Abtheilung: Von Homer bis zur Attischen Prosa. Würzburg, A. Stuber's Verlag, 1884.

<sup>2</sup> The usual treatment of *ἕως* leaves so much untouched that it has seemed worth while to present here a brief synopsis of the usage, which, it is hoped, may suggest something to Professor Schanz's workers, though the presentation is not strictly historical:

*ἕως*, Ep. *εἰως* or *εἰος* (*εἰως* rejected by Curtius, Leo Meyer, and others; *εἰος* suggested by Herm. and Buttm., defended by Leo Meyer; *ἦος* required by A. Nauck and by Curtius, who derives *ἕως* from *ἦφος* by transfer of quantity, while Delbrück derives both *ἦος* and *ἕως* from *ἔφος*; *ἕως* is an iambus only in Od. 2, 78, elsewhere it must be treated as a monosyllable, e. g. Il. 17, 727; Od. 2, 148, or as a trochee (*εἰος* or *ἦος*), Il. 1, 193; 10, 507. In the Asiatic Aeolic and Doric the form is *ἄς* (Ahrens, *Dial. Aeol.*, p. 102; *Dial. Dor.*, p. 200).

A. Relative particle of time corresponding to *τέως*, Il. 20, 42; Od. 4, 90; Ar. Pax 32; *τοόρα*, Il. 15, 390; Od. 12, 327; other correlatives: *ἐν τούτῳ*, Xen. Cyr. 6, 1, 1; *μέχρι τούτου*, Dem. 18, 48; Lys. 12, 37. It contains the notion of temporal limit expressed as to duration by "so long as, while" (Lat. *quandiu*), as to termination by "until, till"; comp. the uses of *dum*, *donec*, *quoad* (Gell. N. A. 6, 21). "'While' now means only 'during the time when,' but in Elizabethan [and dialectic] English, both while and whiles meant also 'up to the time when'" (Abbott).

I. "so long as" (Lat. *quandiu*), action co-extensive. a. imperf. indic. (1) actual occurrence in the past: οἱ δ' εἰως μὲν σίτον ἔχον καὶ αἶνον ἐπιθρῶν

*etymologica* in Attic prose, the absolute participles ἐξόν, etc., use of the prepositions in the ten orators, the impersonal verbs, the development of the future idea, history of the substantivized in-

τόφρα βοῶν ἀπέχοντο, Od. 12, 327; cf. 17, 358 (in this sense often answered in apodosis by a demonstr. adv., by τέως, τείως, Od. 4, 90; by τόφρα, Od. 12, 327; Il. 18, 15; 20, 41; τόφρα δέ, Il. 10, 507; 11, 412, etc.; by δέ alone, Il. 1, 193; Od. 4, 120); Hdt. 2, 57; Aesch. Pers. 710; Soph. El. 951; Lys. 17, 3; 19, 46; Attics generally. νώνυμος ὥς Οἰνόμαος ἄρχε, Pind. O. 10, 51. (2) by attraction. So in a clause dependent on an unfulfilled condition: ὑπῆρχεν ἂν αὐτοῖς—πάσχειν μηδὲν ἕως τῆς θαλάσσης ἤρχον [Xen.], R. A. 2, 14. *b.* pres. subj. w. ἂν (of the future): ἕως ἂν ζῇτε, "so long as" you live, Plat. Conv. 192 E; Aesch. Ag. 1435; Ar. Thesmoph. 582; Lycurg. c. Leocr. 146; Attics generally. *c.* pres. opt. as required by general rules of dependence; so after infin. and ἂν (= opt. and ἂν), Plat. Theaet. 155 A. II. "while," Lat. *dum* = ἐν ᾧ (actions not co-extensive). 1. temporal w. imperf. indic.: εἰως ὃ ταῦθ' ὤρμαινε κατὰ φρένα τόφρα δ' Ἀθήνη ἱσταμένη προσέφη Διομήδεα δῖον, Il. 10, 507, 8; cf. 11, 411, 12; 15, 539; Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 1; ἕως ἂν, w. subj., Ib. 6, 3, 21. 2. ἕως sometimes passes over into a causal or semi-causal sense (comp. ὅτε and ὁπότε), "while, now that, since." So especially w. pres. indic.: Ἔτι is often added and forms of the copulative verb are not unfrequently omitted: οὐκ ἀλέγω, εἰως μοι ἐχέφρων Πηνελόπεια ζῶει, Od. 17, 390; Eur. Or. 238; ἕως δ' ἔτ' ἐμφρων εἰμί, Aesch. Cho. 1026; Ar. Eq. 111; Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 46; Dem. 9, 70; ἕως ἐτι ἐλπίς, Thuc. 8, 40. III. "until, till," Lat. *donec*. 1. as a temporal conjunction. *a.* with indic. chiefly aor. (1) of an actual occurrence in the past: θῦνε διὰ προμάχων εἰως φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν, Il. 11, 342; cf. Od. 5, 123 and Attics; Aesch. Pers. 428. 464; Andoc. 1, 134; Lys. 1, 15; Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 15; 7, 1, 34; Id. Hell. 1, 1, 29; 6, 4, 36; Dem. 18, 48, etc. (2) by assimilation after indic. w. ἂν, in an unreal condition (action not accomplished): ἡδέως ἂν Καλλικλεῖ διελεγόμην ἕως ἀπέδωκα, I should gladly have gone on conversing, "till" I had . . . Plat. Gorg. 506 B; cf. Crat. 396 C; Ar. Pax 71. So after infin. and ἂν (= indic. and ἂν) [Dem.] 49, 35; after ἐχρήν, Lys. 22, 12. For ἕως ἂν w. indic. see Lys. 15, 6 (ἂν om. by Dobree). (3) the imperf. is rare. In ἕως ἀπῆν, Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 4, ἀπῆν may be aoristic; in ταῦτ' ἐποίει ἕως διεδίδου, Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 8, "so long as" and "until" meet. *b.* ἕως ἂν (εἰως κε) w. subj. (chiefly aor.) of the future: μαχήσομαι . . . εἰως κε τέλος πολέμοιο κηρίω, Il. 3, 290, 1; cf. 24, 183; Attics generally, ἕως ἂν δόξη, Lys. 12, 37; [Xen.] R. A. 2, 5; Isoc. 4, 165. So after historical tenses by *repraesentatio*, Xen. Hell. 5, 3, 25; Id. Cyr. 5, 1, 3. (1) omission of κε, εἰος ἱκηται, Il. 13, 141, 2. (2) omission of ἂν chiefly in tragic poetry, with or without final coloring: ἕως μάθης, Soph. Aj. 555; Trach. 148; Phil. 764; O. C. 77. The pres. subj. is not common: οὐκ ἀναμένομεν ἕως ἂν ἡ ἡμετέρα χώρα κακῶται (= ἕως ἂν ἰδωμεν κακουμένην), Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 18. For αἰρωσι, Thuc. 1, 90, Classen reads ἄρωσι, but see Shilleto. *c.* ἕως w. opt. (chiefly aor.). (1) after an historical tense corresponding to ἕως ἂν after a principal tense. Attics: ἔφασαν συνεκπλευσεῖσθαι ἕως τὰ πράγματα κατασταίη, Lys. 13, 25; cf. Ar. Ran. 766; Xen. Hell. 3, 2, 20, etc. In the Od. ἕως w. opt. has more or less finality, "against the time when, in order that," 4, 800; 5, 386; 6, 80; 19, 367. (2) by attraction (assimilation), Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 11; Plat. Resp. 6, 501 C. The pres. opt. is not common: ἕως



inter alia, the final use of *ἄνω* with the inf.<sup>1</sup> To the completion of this task we can look forward with more interest than the reviewer and I as its purpose to report the progress made as fully and accurately as possible. On many of these subjects formulae have been reached by long observation, which only lack the confirmation of the statistical material to pass into laws, and yet the exactness of the required methods demands the completeness which can only be attained by actual count. Negative observations have their use. If Haupt had announced publicly his discovery that Isocrates does not use *σύν*, Mommsen's valuable

conclusion (Zur 2. 370 final): *ἕως δέω*, Thuc. 3, 102, cf. *δ. fin. d. opt. w. κε*: *ἕως ἄν τις* (cf. 2, 78) (*κε w. opt.* in Homer being often substantially a future). In Attic *ἕως* *ἄν* *w. opt.*, *ἄν* seems generally to be retained from the original use in the construction: *τοῦτο δ' ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς πόλεως ἕως ἄν οἱ* (cf. Thuc. 2, 102, 103); *ἕως ἄν ἀποκριναι* (cf. 1, 31); *ἕως ἄν σκέψαιτο*, Plat. Phaed. 101 D, cf. Isocr. 17, 15; *ἕως ἄν* with fut. indic. (rare): *τρυμένετε ἕως τὸν ὄχλον διωσόμεθα* (?), Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 30; *ἕως ἄν* (= fut.), Plut. Lycurg. 29. Fut. opt.: *ἕως ἄν* (cf. Xen. Heil. 4, 4, 9 (v. l. *ἄν*)). *f. with inf.* (after the analogy of *ἄν*, only in later authors, Dion. Hal. Ant. 9, 15. 2. with single words like *ἕως*, *ἄν*, Lat. *usque*. *a.* adverbs of time: *ἕως ὅτε*, Lat. *usque dum* (later authors); *ἕως ὅτε* (= *ὅτε*), Hdt. 2, 103; *ἕως πότε*, *quousque*?, "how long," N. T. (For *ἕως* in Thuc. 3, 108, read *ἕως ὅτε*.) With an adverb of place, Ev. Luc. 23, 5. *b.* with gen.: *ἕως τοῦ λαβεῖν* Polybius 5, 10, 3 and often as 1, 18. 34. 64. 60, etc., (not noticed by Krebs, Die Praepositionen bei Polybius, Würzburg, 1882), later writers. *c.* with a preposition: *ἕως πρὸς καλὸν ἔφον ἀστέρα*, Anth. P. 5, 201; and of place: *ἕως εἰς τὸν χάρακα*, Polyb. 1, 11, 4.

B. In Homer sometimes absolutely = *τέως*, "for a while, meantime," usually combined with *μέν*, *ἕως μὲν . . ὀρνυον αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα . .* Il. 12, 141; *ἕως μὲν ἔπειτα . . ἀλλ' ὅτε . .* Id. 13, 143; cf. 15, 277; 17, 727. 730; Od. 2, 148, etc.; "all the while," Od. 3, 126. In Hdt. 8, 74, Bekker and others write *τέως*.

<sup>1</sup>The final *τοῖ* with the inf. will hardly require a long treatise. The enormous range of it in non-classic, especially Biblical, Greek stands in striking contrast to the very limited use of it in Attic. Weiske (see Am. Journ. of Phil. IV 241) gives only the following examples from Plato, Xenophon, Thucydides and the Attic orators.

Without *μή*: Thuc. 1, 4; 8, 39, 4. Xen. Lac. resp. 8, 3; de re eq. 2, 1. Plat. Resp. 518 D; Leg. 684 A, 657 B; Gorg. 457 E. Dem. 24, 36, 133; 45, 41; 47, 63.

With *μή*: Thuc. 1, 23, 5; 2, 22, 1; 2, 32, 2; 2, 75, 1; 2, 75, 5; 2, 93, 4; 5, 27, 2; 5, 72, 4; 8, 14, 1. Lysias 8, 17. Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 9; 1, 6, 40; Oec. 7, 19. (Cyr. 3, 1, 27 does not count, as Weiske observes.) Plat. Pol. 305 B; Leg. 816 E. Dem. 18, 107; 21, 76; 38, 16, 24; 54, 18, 19; 59, 57, 106, 112, 114. Lycurg. 142.

The underscored numbers represent the present tense.

work would have been hastened by several years. The observation that Homer does not use the *oratio obliqua* opt. for the indicative except in questions was made long since, but Delbrück in his *Coniunctiv u. Opt.* (p. 255) does not bring out the fact distinctly, calls an interrogative a relative, adduces a bad reading in Σ 512, where *ἔεργοι* is an unfortunate conjecture of Bekker's, and omits the only example in Homer that would seem to coincide with later usage ω 237: *εἰπεῖν ὥς ἔλθοι καὶ ἵκοιτ' ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν*—a construction which might be set down as a sign of the later origin of this book. The importance of this phenomenon in the development of *oratio obliqua* is evident.

So in the matter of the final sentence, any one who has read Greek attentively ought to have noticed the rarity of ὥς in Attic prose. Here again, as in the matter of σύν, Xenophon has dulled our perceptions. He uses ὥς final with freedom. Thukydides has no ὥς with the subj., but one ὥς δὲν with subj. (6, 91, 4), but one opt. and that with μάλιστα (4, 4, 2) according to Wisen.<sup>1</sup> In the standard orators ὥς pure is very rare, if it exists at all. In Antiphon 4, β, 1; 6, 15, ὥς may be classed with the Ionism ἀναγινωσκόμενος (2, β, 7). In Plato a similar result may be expected.<sup>2</sup> The rarity of it in Attic comedy has been a matter of notoriety since Elmsley's time. And yet so elementary a matter has not found its way into the ordinary manuals.<sup>3</sup> It will be brought out doubtless with due emphasis in the second part of Dr. Weber's treatise, to the first part of which we must now address ourselves.

*Nihil est in hypotaxi quod non prius fuerit in parataxi* is the motto of recent investigators. Parataxis, which used to be thrust into the background, has come forward and claimed its rights. Oc-

<sup>1</sup> De vi et usu particulae ὥς apud Thucydidem. Hauniae, 1862.

<sup>2</sup> After this review had been put in type I received from a former pupil, Mr. H. A. Short, of New York, a thesis on the development and use of ὥς final, a subject to which I directed his attention some months since. I forewarned him that the result would be chiefly negative in model Attic prose, and after a careful examination of the Attic orators he has added very little to my collection. His examples under ὥς w. subj. are Antiphon 4, β, 1 and 6, 15, Lys. 28, 14, where Markland reads ποιήσουσι, Dem. 18, 289 (quotation from an epigram). In Lys. 13, 20 ὥς belongs to τοιοῦτοις οὖσιν. From Plato he has only the passage cited in Ast. Resp. I 349 C ὥς ἀπάντων λάβη πλεῖστον: ὥς with opt. occurs Andok. 1, 99. In Plat. Tim. 92 A ὥς μᾶλλον ἔλκοιντο the comparative has its influence. Besides, the passage is highflown. Xenophon, as was said before, does not count.

<sup>3</sup> See Wecklein, *Curae Epigraphicae*, p. 42.

casionaly, however, too much is demanded. No infinitive construction can be explained by parataxis, for the infinitive is by its very nature dependent. Some allowance must be made for crystalized formulae. So while we do not insist on supplying a special word when ὅπως with the future is used imperatively, yet ὅπως with the fut. does not stand in development on the same line with μή and the indicative, which is clearly paratactic.

Weber, then, or Schanz, begins with parataxis, as might be expected, and takes up Homer first.

### C. I. *The final sentence in Homer.*

Purpose may be expressed in a simple sentence: ἀποθανεῖν θελῶ says the Sibyl in Petronius, 'ich will sterben,' says Weber. Or you can put the design in two sentences (parataxis), 'Tell me, I want to know.' This, the natural order of thought, is also the natural order of the words. So in HOMER the final sentence is usually put second. γ 7: ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος ἵπποδάμοιο· εἶδομεν ἦν τινα μῆτιν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κέκευθεν. These sentences, however, are comparatively rare survivals, and the final relation is not usually left to be indicated by the voice of the speaker. Now to make hypotaxis out of parataxis we must have a joint. That joint must be at the head of the clause that is to be made dependent. In this case the joint is μή, although we must be careful to note that the function of a joint is not innate, it is due to position chiefly. The mood supplies the inner union. This is the first stage.

Weber next considers the category of the sentences of fear—those sentences in which the old parataxis has fixed itself and has held its own. Without parataxis the Greek constructions of verbs of fear cannot be properly explained, the Latin constructions cannot possibly be explained. The particle μή, the negative of the will, is naturally enough the negative of fear. The expression of a verb of fear is a later step, as it indicates a more advanced analysis; so that the grammarians who speak of the omission of a verb of fear in certain combinations are reversing the historical process. The growth is illustrated by Σ 8: μὴ δὴ μοι τελέσῃσι θεοὶ κακὰ κήδεα θυμῷ, and ω 4, 91: ἐξελθὼν τις ἴδοι, μὴ δὴ σχεδὸν ὤσι κιώντες, and K 538: ἀλλ' αἰνῶς δείδοικα κατὰ φρένα, μή τι πάθωσιν. The sentences are really never welded. Ἵνα cannot be used because one does not fear to an end. Ὅπως is not a final particle and does not count. Μὴ οὐ is resistance

to a negative like *ne-non*. That it occurs only in the Iliad does not seem to be a fact of any great significance. When a verb of fear is not expressed, the emotion must be gathered from the context. The translation 'whether' for *μή* in *δρᾶν μή* is a mere convenience, as Weber says, though it is not to be denied that there is an interrogative element in the emotional situation. The half-interrogative, half-final character of *si* in Latin, which shows itself chiefly after verbs involving effort and so risk and apprehension, is instructive. After historical tenses of verbs of fear the opt. is the rule in Homer and the prevalent tense is the aorist. Weber gives no explanation of this. The explanation lies in the negative (Am. Journ. of Phil. II 466). It has already been said that parataxis holds throughout in verbs of fear, but Weber cites the famous example ε 300: *δεῖδω μή δὴ πάντα θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν* as a specimen of an insoluble unit. But the resistance to an accomplished fact can just as well be severed from the *δεῖδω* as the apprehension of the future in the former case. And just here it is important to emphasize the fact that the dependencies of verbs of fear are distinctly separated from the dependencies of ordinary final sentences by the elasticity of the tenses. After a verb of fear the present subjunctive may refer to future action or future ascertainment; the perfect subjunctive to future action or future ascertainment; whereas in the ordinary final sentence action and ascertainment must both fall in the future. See the examples in Liddell and Scott, 7 ed. s. v. *μή*, B 8.

The next section treats of the positive final sentence with *ὥς*. 'Ὡς means 'in this manner,' 'so,' and can only refer to a definite action. Weber illustrates by B 362: *κρίν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας, Ἀγάμεμνον, | ὥς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγη, φύλα δὲ φύλοις*, 'so shall brotherhood help brotherhood.' With this statement that *ὥς* is originally modal, that it has to do with manner originally rather than with an end, all scholars will agree. Dähl, in his excellent essay on *ut* (see the review in Am. Journ. Philol. III 229) has shown the same thing for the corresponding particle in Latin. In English we need 'so,' 'as' and 'how,' all three, for working out the Greek *ὥς*. 'Ὡς, as Weber admits, early becomes conjunctive, and this may be called the transition from 'so' to 'how.' That *ὥς* is not purely final' is practically shown by the combination with *κέν* and *ἄν*; for *ἵνα*, the purely final participle, never takes *ἄν*, as has long been known. Weber's roundabout explanation of *ὥς κέν*, *ὥς ἄν* will hardly

<sup>1</sup> Nägelsbach insists on the relative nature, Ann. zur. Il. I, 32. See also Kühnast, Die Repraesentation, s. 147.

commend itself to non-Teutonic grammarians. The formula  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\nu = \eta\nu \pi\omega\varsigma$  explains the situation in a word, and shows at a glance the balancing between purpose and reflexion. With  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\nu$  you take the chances; with  $\iota\nu\alpha$  you disregard the chances. The translation of  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \delta\nu$  'that so,' though somewhat stiff and old-fashioned, is fairly exact.<sup>1</sup> This is one of the points omitted by the editors in the Liddell and Scott  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ , and not to the advantage of the article.  $\Omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\omega\varsigma \delta\nu$  are to be explained in the same way. They are final only as the conditional is final, a finality claimed by Lange and accorded by Monro (Homeric Gr. p. 212.)<sup>2</sup>

In the Iliad, according to Weber, the instances with  $\omega\varsigma$  pure preponderate slightly (16:15), in the Odyssey  $\omega\varsigma \delta\nu$  and  $\omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon$  have a heavy preponderance over  $\omega\varsigma$  (23:9). This spread of the tentative form coincides happily with the character of the crafty Odysseus.

When we reach  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  we are on different ground. We have now to do with a developed relative or interrogative. For  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  final Weber has but one passage to produce from the Iliad,  $\Phi$  547, the same one adduced in the L. and S. article. There are seven in the Odyssey according to Weber's count. The transition from the modal to the final is thus established.

The next final particle in Homer is  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ , a temporal particle, which, like all temporal particles of limit, such as  $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  and  $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ , can be used with a final coloring. But the final use of  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  is so extensive that it has overshadowed its temporal use, and so Liddell and Scott make the final sense the leading sense.  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  is 'so long' and then 'till.' It is easy to see from the Latin *dum* how the final sense comes in. The English 'until' with the subjunctive often has a distinctly final sense, and in fact the subjunctive holds its own at that point better than at any other in English. 'Till' = 'in order that,' and 'before' = 'in order that not,' may help 'lest' to keep the perishing English subjunctive alive.  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  as a final particle is familiar in Homer. Weber speaks of the 'repugnance of  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  to  $\mu\eta$ .' "'Until' ('bis')," says Weber, after Keil, "resists a negation of the action and can only be used of the cessation of the action." It would have been more simple to say that the 'until' idea

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\acute{\eta}\nu \epsilon\acute{\xi}\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$  (Phil. 3, 11) reappears in Bishop Ken's Evening Hymn: 'Teach me to die *that so* I may | Rise glorious at the awful day.'

<sup>2</sup> So in the complementary final sentences,  $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , followed by  $\alpha\acute{\iota} \kappa\epsilon$  subj. E 279, T 70 and by  $\epsilon\acute{\iota} \pi\omega\varsigma$  opt. N 806, T 384, is followed by  $\omega\varsigma \kappa\epsilon$ ,  $\Phi$  459.

is itself negative.<sup>1</sup> In the passages where *ὅφρα μή* does occur, A 118, 578, γ 303, it seems to be purely final without any temporal shade.

Weber further notices, after Keil, the large use of *τάχιστα* with *ὅφρα*, which is easily to be explained from its temporal action. That *ἕως* with the opt. has a prevalent final use in the Odyssey is an old story. The final conjunction proper is *ἵνα*. 'Ὡς and *ὅφρα* are only imperfect adumbrations of purpose; *εἰ*, as *si* in Latin, may hint at it, as we have seen above, but *ἵνα* is the only clear and distinct final particle. Weber follows Curtius in considering it an instrumental 'wherewith,' but acquiesces in the practical result that *ἵνα* is 'where' and 'whither' at the point where we begin to trace its development.' Why this local particle should have been selected to express the pure final relation rather than *ὥς* and *ὅφρα* is not brought out very satisfactorily by Weber. The simplest explanation would seem to be that the end to be reached ('whither') is a more natural expression of finality than either the manner (*ὥς*) or the limit (*ὅφρα*). At any rate *ἵνα* retired more and more from the province 'where,' and peeps out only here and there in Attic; and it is noteworthy that when it does emerge, as it does in later Greek, *ὥς* final comes back. Of negated *ὅφρα* Weber counts three instances (x 56 he refuses to count). 'Ὡς μή occurs seven times; *ὥς ἂν μή* three; *ἵνα μή* sixteen times in the Iliad, ten in the Odyssey. There are consequently only 39 in all, whereas there are 108 final sentences in Homer with a simple *μή*—a striking proof of the predominance of the paratactic form in this period.

With a wise forethought Dr. Weber has given statistics of the usage in Homer from various points of view. These statements will be found useful to investigators who have other lines of research to follow, but it will be unnecessary to reproduce the whole mass here. It will suffice to give the table of the complete final sentence in Homer:

1.	<i>ὅφρα</i>	237	117 Il.	120 Od.
2.	<i>ἵνα</i>	145	67	78
3.	<i>ὥς</i>	63	31	32
4.	<i>ὅπως</i>	9	2	7
5.	<i>ἕως</i>	5	0	5
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		459	217 Il.	242 Od.

<sup>1</sup> Gellert: Er wird sich nicht zur Ehe entschliessen bis er nicht eine hinlängliche Versorgung hat. Das klingt französisch, say the Grimms, but so far as a foreigner can judge it is idiomatic German, and occurs also with 'bevor' and 'ehe,' e.g. Gehe nicht eher fort bis er kommt (oder auch) nicht kommt, Sanders, Hauptschwierigkeiten der deutschen Sprache, S. 83.

<sup>2</sup> See Liddell and Scott, ed. 7, s. v.

As the Iliad contains 15,693 verses, the Odyssey 12,109, it would appear that the final sentence has extended its range in the Odyssey. The proportion in the Iliad is 1 : 70, in the Odyssey 1 : 50. The younger poem shows an advance in hypotaxis while the general use of the particles is the same. Only *ὅπως* becomes final in the Odyssey and *ἵως* undertakes to set up a final use.

We now turn to the combination of the final particles with *κέν* and *ἄν*. Weber calls these sentences final and considers the transition as effected. The table given is as follows :

	<i>Subj.</i>		<i>Opt.</i>			<i>Total.</i>	
<i>ἵνα κε</i>	ο Il.	ι Od.	ο Il.	ι Od.	=	ο Il.	ι Od. <sup>1</sup>
<i>ὅφρα κε</i>	1	6	1	0	=	2	6
<i>ὅφρ' ἄν</i>	2	3	0	1	=	2	4
<i>ὥς κε</i>	11	9	0	5	=	11	14
<i>ὥς ἄν</i>	3	6	1	3	=	4	9
						<hr/>	<hr/>
						19 Il.	34 Od.

This shows a decided advance in the use of the particles. The use with the opt. is almost wholly confined to the Odyssey.

Against the statement of Weber that the Odyssey shows a tendency to develop *ἵνα κε* in the complete final sentence, objections might be raised. The only passage where the combination occurs is sufficiently well known. In *μ* 156 we read :

ἀλλ' ἐρέω μὲν ἐγών, ἵνα εἰδότες ἦ κε θάνωμεν  
ἦ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν<sup>2</sup>

Here the construction has got a twist, thanks to *εἰδότες*, as if the speaker had started to say *εἰδῶμεν*. Comp. *Θ* 533 : *εἴσομαι ἦ κέ μ' ὁ Τυδείδης κρατερὸς Διομήδης | πὰρ νηῶν πρὸς τεῖχος ἀπώσεται, ἦ κεν ἐγὼ τὸν | χαλκῷ δηώσας ἕναρα βροτόεντα φέρωμαι.*<sup>3</sup> Bäumlein accounts for the slip in substantially the same manner (*Gr. Modi*, s. 194), and Kühner follows him II 191, Anm. 6. Against this Weber has nothing to urge except the fact that the construction occurs in the Odyssey, and may be considered as a development, which had extended from the other final sentences to this. He is perfectly right in

<sup>1</sup> As *μ* 156 has both subj. and opt. Weber counts it only once.

<sup>2</sup> Where many read *φύγωμεν*, which is supported by Schol. II : *ἐν ἀμφοτέροις πλεονάζει ὁ κεν ἢ ἐλώμεθα τὸν θάνατον ἢ τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν παρὰσκευασώμεθα.*

<sup>3</sup> An interposed participle readily shifts a construction. See the note on Soph. O. C. 1024 : *οὐ μὴ ποτε | χώρας φυγόντες τῆσδ' ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς.* *Am. Journ. of Philol.* III 516.



saying that *κέν* and *ἄν* have no business in the purely final clause. The essence of pure purpose is disregard of limitations, but *ἵνα* is the only purely final particle, and *ὅφρα κε*, *ὅφρ' ἄν*, *ὥς κε*, *ὥς ἄν* have relative, temporal, conditional coloring. To show in detail the truth of this statement would require more space than can be spared. Suffice it to say that these *ἄν* and *κέν* groups show very distinctly the transition to the final, which, according to Weber, they actually reach, which they certainly approach very closely. Noteworthy would seem to be the large use of the imperative or equivalents in the preceding clause, so that we have an expression of the will followed by a study of the conditions consequent upon the putting forth of the action postulated.<sup>1</sup> Weber now asks the question why *κέν* and *ἄν* are excluded from the pure final sentence, and this leads to a discussion of the character of *κέν* and *ἄν* which results in the acceptance of Lange's view, a parallelism of *εἰς* and *ἄν*, of *τὶς* and *κέν*. The whole subject having been recently discussed in this Journal may be passed over (III 446 foll.) The simple solution seems to be that the conditioning of a purpose destroys its absolute voluntative power. The will is 'sicklied o'er' by reflexion. *ἵνα* with the subj. is Lady Macbeth, *ὥς ἄν* is her husband.

Weber next considers the sequence of tenses in Homeric final sentences. As a rule principal tenses are followed by the subjunctive, historical by the optative. Exceptions in which the opt. follows principal tenses are rare, and most of them disappear upon close inspection. It would seem ridiculous even to adduce ρ 242 and φ 201 where *ὥς ἔλθοι* is an independent wish and not a final sentence; but even recent editors have punctuated badly. Σ 88, Η 339 *εἶη* may readily be changed into *ῆη*. Α 344 *μαχέονται* is an un-Homeric form, as Homer does not use the opt. in *-οιντο*, only that in *-οιατο* (Curtius, Gr. Verb, I 94). The hiatus is a hateful one, *μαχέονται Ἀχαιοί*, Hoffmann's *μαχεοίατ' Ἀχαιοί* is bad, and we must read *μαχέονται*, which some blundering scribe put into a supposed fut. opt. *μαχέοιντο*. For ἀλφοι, ρ 249, Nauck reads ἀλφη.

The cases where *ὥς κε* and *ὥς ἄν* occur with the optative present no difficulty whatever. Indeed it is hardly necessary to resort, as Weber does, to the independent sentence. It is nothing more than the familiar potential construction, in which adaptation runs into finality, as in Η 342: *ἐκτοσθεν δὲ βαθείαν ὀρύξομεν ἐγγύθι τάφρον, |*

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Α 32: *ἀλλ' ἰθι, μή μ' ἐρέθιζε, σαώτερος ὥς κε νήπαι.*



not help us forward. It is well known that Lucian often uses *ὥς* with the opt. after principal sentences. (See Heller, *Symbolae Ioachimicae*, Berl. 1880, 282-329.) The conclusion reached by some Lucianic scholar (whether Heller or another, I cannot recall) is that *ὥς* with the opt. representing, as it does, the actual conception of the wish, is more 'vivid' than the normal subjunctive. A word that can be turned round so completely is hardly fit for grammatical use. The more cautious way of stating the phenomenon would be that in the transfer to the past the will may lose its practical basis and so be assimilated to the wish. Lange, as is well known,<sup>1</sup> calls the opt. the mood of the imagination, and sees in the use of the opt. after the past tenses not a makeshift, as Weber does, after Delbrück, but a *ψυχικὴ διάθεσις*. Against this Weber urges the fact that the optative is not used after the principal tenses. If the difference is that of a *ψυχικὴ διάθεσις*, why should not the principal tenses have a right to the shift also? But the question to be asked is rather this: Is the *ψυχικὴ διάθεσις*, which would take the optative after principal tenses, natural? Would it be likely to occur? If the notion is that of wish rather than of will or purpose, should we not expect to find an independent expression of wish rather than a formulated final sentence? Nor can we altogether overlook the historical endings of the optative. Almost every one now recognizes the fact that *-μ* of the opt. is a false formation, and the secondary endings must be taken into account in getting at the original meaning of the optative. That the Greek did not develop secondary tenses for the subjunctive nor principal tenses for the optative is of prime significance, though it by no means commits us to Kühner's view of the relation of the moods. Optative for subjunctive then is not a mere makeshift; and Weber, while following Delbrück, uses language which is a curious specimen of grammatical hedging. 'Für uns ist Optativ ein zwar nicht ohne Berechtigung, aber doch immerhin willkürliches gewähltes Ersatzmittel für den Coniunctiv der historischen Zeiten.' Grant the justification and everything is granted. Language does not need anything more. Language is satisfied with a hint.

The subjunctive as the mood of the will is entitled to follow the historical tenses. In standard prose the use of opt. or subj. depends to a considerable extent on the individuality of the author. The

<sup>1</sup> *Ei mit dem opt.* p. 394 (88). See *Amer. Journ. of Philol.* III 437.

author that puts himself with more directness into relation with the time of which he is writing will incline to the subjunctive (*repraesentatio*). The more mechanical writer will be more apt to follow the established sequence. Other exceptions are due to the interference of the actual present of the writer. Here and there we have an aorist that does service regularly as the shorthand of the perfect, the perfect being either non-existent or appropriated to present use. This last proposition is denied by Weber after Novotny, but we must recognize the fact syntactically that the aorist has often to serve as a substitute for the perfect. There were not perfects enough in Greek, and hence in later times perfects were manufactured to meet the demand for a wooden uniformity.<sup>1</sup>

The explanation for Homer is fundamentally the same, although we may use other terms. In Homer, says Weber, we have the survival of the original parataxis. This is just what *repraesentatio* is for the later period. In either case we are transported to the original conception.

The future indicative came into the final sentence through the relative. It came in through the temporal, says Weber, in the case of ὅφρα. It would be better to say through the relative element of ὅφρα, for the fut. rebels against the combination with the temporal particle except so far as the temporal particle is relative. For final ὅφρα with fut., Weber cites ρ 6 and δ 162. The development of final ὅπως has been traced in the article in L. and S. Μή with the fut. occurs twice in the formula μή πῶς τοι Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται (ν 300, ω 543), which Weber considers an isolated effort to bring the future into dependence on μή.

In negative sentences with μή the aor. subj. after principal tenses, the aorist opt. after secondary tenses, preponderate greatly, as compared with the present subj. and the present opt. This was only what was to be expected. The natural tense of the negative is the aorist.<sup>2</sup> But we find that the aor. subj. preponderates in

<sup>1</sup> When the perfect is used as a present, the aorist is used as a perfect. So ἐκτησάμην, 'I have gained possession of,' κέκτημαι, 'I possess,' as in the classic example Herodot. 7, 29: κέκτησο αὐτὸς τάπερ αὐτὸς ἐκτήσαο. In Isokr. 5, 19-21 we find a string of perfects, and at the end of them a solitary κατέστησεν. Why? Καθίστημι has no transitive perfect. So in Lysias 12, 3, κατέστην is followed by μὴ ποιήσωμαι. To call this explanation a 'Nothbehelf,' as Weber does, is absurd. It is merely a recognition of a breakdown in the apparatus of language. The 'Nothbehelf' is not in the grammarian, it is in the Greek. For Homer, see the examples in La Roche, N 624.

<sup>2</sup> See American Journal of Philology, III 466.

positive final sentences. As it is true that in the final sentence we more commonly look forward to the attainment of a result than to the continuance of a condition to be reached, this phenomenon is not inexplicable. More puzzling is the fact that in the opt., after past tenses with final particles, the pres. and the aor. nearly balance. Weber suggests that the transfer to the past has dulled the sense for the difference between present and aorist; but in that case we should rather expect the aor., which is the more common tense in the untransferred final sentence, the more common tense in the opt. of wish, and for the same reason. Mere counting will not answer here. The forms must be weighed.  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta$  may be changed into  $\eta\eta$ . If  $\pi\epsilon\lambdaοιτο$  is a present opt., where is its aorist? Such a question must be attacked in all its details. So in the development of the articular infinitive it is of some moment to watch the kind of words that first submit to the combination.

In the next section Weber takes up what he calls the incomplete final sentences, by which he means those final sentences in which there is no expression of work to an end, where the translation is 'that,' not 'in order that.' They are sometimes called complementary final sentences, and follow verbs of will and endeavor. In Greek, verbs of will seldom take this construction. The particles are  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  and  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ . The whole build of the sentences clearly shows the relative rather than the final nature, and it is not necessary to subject the examples given to a special scrutiny here. See Liddell and Scott, s. v.  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ , where, however, verbs of ways and means are separated from verbs of will and endeavor, because in verbs denoting contrivance (verbs of ways and means) the relative and interrogative elements come out much more clearly.

This completes the exhibition of the final sentence in Homer. As the theoretical discussion turns chiefly on the usage in Homer, the final sentences elsewhere can be dispatched more rapidly.

### C. II. *Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns.*

In HESIOD there are 36 final sentences, according to Weber. Hesiod has one final sentence to 64 verses, so that he stands half way between Iliad (1 : 72) and Odyssey (1 : 50).  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  (11) gains heavily on  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  (10). In Homer  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$  had only 145 against the 237 of  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ . Parataxis in the  $\mu\eta$  sentences preponderates in Hesiod. The principal tenses are followed by the subj. pres. (18) and aor. (8), whereas in Homer the aor. preponderates over the present, a

point of difference that Weber does not notice. Here again counting will not suffice. The historical tenses are followed by opt. pres. (5) and aor. (3), and by subj. twice. The opt. after principal tenses occurs twice, both the examples (O. et D. 606, 576) have  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta$ , where Weber would read  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\eta$  or  $\tilde{\eta}\eta$ . The complementary final sentence is represented by three examples, two with  $\kappa\epsilon$  (O. et D. 306, 308), one with  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  (O. et D. 349).

In the Homeric Hymns  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  is used 5 times,  $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$  5,  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha \kappa\epsilon$  once,  $\phi\varsigma \kappa\epsilon$  once. In what Weber calls complete final sentences (final sentences proper),  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha \kappa\epsilon \mu\acute{\eta}$  with the opt. is a curiosity (in Cerer. 131), which is to be explained by the relative nature of  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ . In the Batrachomyomachia the only final particle is  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ , which occurs 64, 151, 249, an additional proof, if proof were needed, of the later origin of the poem. The only important points to be noted in the comparison of Hesiod and the Hymns with Homer is the absence of  $\tilde{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$  final, of  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ , the fut. indicative final, and the decline of  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ .

### C. III. *Lyric Poets.*

PINDAR has no  $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$ , a fact sufficiently emphasized by Erdmann and others. Pindar's favorite particle is  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$ , which had the high antique tone suited to his soaring style. Weber counts only twenty 'complete' final sentences in Pindar, a small number, he remarks. The small number is due to the free use that Pindar makes of the final infinitive.

The final particles are distributed thus:  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha$  11,  $\omega\varsigma$  3,  $\omega\varsigma \tilde{\alpha}\nu$  1,  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  1,  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  4.  $\tilde{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$  occurs N 3, 58:  $\delta\phi\rho\alpha \dots \epsilon\nu \phi\rho\alpha\sigma\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\iota\theta' \delta\pi\omega\varsigma \sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota \mu\acute{\eta} \kappa\omicron\iota\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma \delta\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega \dots \text{Μέμνων} \mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ . Bergk. would have us read  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\iota \theta\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ , which Weber approves, evidently for the pleasure of wiping  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  out of the Pindaric final particles. It is hard to see why  $\epsilon\nu \phi\rho\alpha\sigma\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$  should not be construed like  $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$ . As for  $\omega\varsigma \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ , that (O 7, 42) follows  $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , and might also be put down among the complementary final sentences, though the opt. with  $\tilde{\alpha}\nu$  might be regarded there as an imperative, as the opt. with  $\kappa\epsilon$  is an imperative in the famous Elean inscription (Boeckh, CIG 11, Cauer<sup>2</sup> 258).

If there is no reason to change the solitary  $\omega\varsigma \tilde{\alpha}\nu$ , there is no reason to change the solitary  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ .  $\tilde{\omicron}\phi\rho\alpha \mu\acute{\eta}$  is used only once P 5, 62,  $\omega\varsigma \mu\acute{\eta}$  N 8, 36.

Principal tenses are followed by the subjunctive, pres. (3) and aor. (3). Historical tenses by the opt. pres. (2) and aor. (6). The sequence of the subj. after historical tenses is perfectly explicable

in P 4, 90, where the purpose holds for all time, and in O 4, 13, where *κατέβαν* is one of the aor. to which reference was made above.

Attraction of mood, opt. after opt. of wish, occurs N 8, 35 and P 5, 118.

The fut. indic. does not occur, for, like the reviewer, Weber considers *βάσομεν* (O 6, 24) a subjunctive.<sup>1</sup> The only complementary final sentence, and that with *ῥοῖα*, occurs P 1, 71.

The statistic of the lyric poets generally does not seem to be of any great value, on account of the fragmentary character of their remains, and on account of the extensive interpolations. To be sure, Weber rejects Pseudophokylides, but will he venture to maintain the genuineness of everything that goes under the name of Theognis? It is certainly dangerous to speak of historical development here. Pindar is clearly an eclectic, as Weber has admitted in the case of *ῥοῖα*, and we need a wider basis of induction before we can distinguish what is individual taste, what is historical growth.

*ῥοῖα* occurs in six passages, *ἵνα* in three, *ὥς* in four, *ὥς ἂν* in two, *ὅπως* (*ὅκως*) in two. *ὥς* and *ὅπως* occur chiefly in Hipponax and Anakreon. Of this Weber ventures no explanation. The explanation may be local.

In Simonides (103, 3) *μή* is separated from *ἵνα*. The paratactic *μή* holds its own. We have attraction of mood in Theognis 885, 1119. There are two complementary final sentences (both with verbs of ways and means). In Solon (13, 37) for the first time the final sentence precedes, Hymn. in Ven. (4), 126 being set down as interpolated. The position, however, is rendered easier by a following *τοῦτο*:

*ὥς ὑγιὲς ἔσται, τοῦτο κατεφράσατο.*

The conclusion of the whole matter is that there is no marked deviation from Homer in the whole period which we may call pre-Attic. The characteristics of the pre-Attic period are thus summed up: (1) The final conjunction *ῥοῖα* dominates; (2) Absence of *ὅπως ἂν*; (3) Preponderance of paratactic *μή*; (4) Isolated use of the future; (5) No indic. preterite after unreal conditions and the like; (6) No independent *ὅπως* (*ὅπως* fut. indic. without leading verb); (7) The final sentence is always subsecutive.

At the close of this period we part forever with *ῥοῖα*.

<sup>1</sup> See American Journal of Philology, III 441.

C. IV. *The Dramatic Poets.*

A new period opens with AISCHYLOS. Paratactic μή, as Weber calls it, occurs seven times. The aor. subj. is used throughout after principal tenses, counting as such πράξαιμ' ἄν (not πράξαιμ', as Weber says), except in Ag. 1624: πρὸς κέντρα μή λάκτιζε μή πταίσας μογῆς, where, as has been explained above, the participle accounts for the twist. Evidently μή with the aor. subj. has become an imperative formula.

There are four verbs of fear followed by the aor. subj. Φόβφ with μή takes the subj. followed by fut. ind. in Pers. 117: μή πόλις πύθεται . . . καὶ τὸ Κισσίων πόλισμ' ἀντίδουπον ἄσεται . . . βυσσίνοις δ' ἐν πέπλοις πέση λακίς. This is the first time that a verb of fear takes μή with the future. That Aischylos does not use μή οὐ with the subj. seems to be an accident; he uses it freely enough with the infinitive, which is an incorporated μή οὐ with subjunctive. Instructive is the fact, not adduced by Weber, that he does not use οὐ μή with anything but the aorist, showing the same habit here as with μή. The absence of the opt. after verbs of fear is not unrelated to Aischylos' avoidance of the opt. elsewhere. He does not use it after ἕως nor after πρίν.

To the incomplete final sentences Weber assigns Pr. 334 (πάπταινε), 390 (φυλάσσου), Eum. 255 (λεῦσσε), all verbs at least involving apprehension.

The table of the complete final sentence is as follows:

	ἵνα	ὅπως	ὅπως ἄν	ὥς ἄν	ὥς	
Prom.	1	2	1	3	5	12
Sept.	1	1			3	5
Pers.		1			1	2
Suppl.		1	1	3	3	8
Agam.		1	1	1	1	4
Choeph.		3	1		5	9
Eum.		2	2	4	5	13
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2	11	6	11	23	53

Μή is used with a final particle ten times, without a final particle seven times, as we have seen. Subordination has outstripped co-ordination, and μή is sometimes separated from the final particle. The development is μή, ὅπως μή, ὅπως—μή. Ὅφρα has disappeared as a final particle, but it is almost comic to say that ἵνα was nigh unto destruction, because there are only two instances in Aischylos. So

far from considering this 'the more remarkable because Aischylos uses *ἵνα* in a local sense five times,' it would seem natural to suppose that the local use checked the final use. *Ὅπως ἄν* appears for the first time as a final combination, but as *ὅπως κε* had been used in Homer, it is not surprising that Aischylos should have used *ὅπως ἄν*, *κέν* being excluded from his dialect. The ratio of the pure to the impure (*ἄν* or *κέν*) final sentence is as follows: Homer 7 : 1; Hesiod 8 : 1; Hymns 4 : 1; Pindar 15 : 1; Aischylos 2 : 1; Lyrics 7 : 1. These figures show, says Weber, a great advance of the impure final conjunction in Aischylos. But what do the figures prove for Pindar? A rebellion against Homer? Over-interpretation of statistics may bring the whole matter, useful as it is, into ridicule, and we must not undertake to prove that the *Persae* and the *Septem* are the oldest plays of Aischylos by the non-occurrence of *ὡς ἄν* and *ὅπως ἄν*.

The so-called attraction of the final dependency into the indicative of the unreal occurs for the first time in Aischylos, twice with *ὅπως* (Pr. 747, Cho. 195), once with *ὡς* (Pr. 1152). The examples are familiar. The true explanation is that the dependent clause is really the main clause. The wish for the means is really a wish for the end. The variation of construction from ind. to opt., which we find elsewhere, is due to this shift.<sup>1</sup> But this matter will come up under the final sentence in Attic prose. Suffice it to say here that this attraction is rooted in the language. If there is not an unreal *ὅπως* in Homer, there is an unreal *πρίν* (δ 177).<sup>2</sup>

As to the moods we have the following results :

		<i>ἵνα</i>	<i>ὡς</i>	<i>ὅπως</i>
After Principal tenses.	Subj. pres.		8	1
	aor.	1	9	1
After Secondary tenses.	Subj. aor.		1	
	Opt. pres.	1	2	
	aor.		1	1
	pres. and aor.			1

<sup>1</sup> In Plato, *Meno* 89 A, the change from *διέφθειρεν* to *γίγνονται* is due to the intercalated generic clause with *ἀφίκοιντο*.

<sup>2</sup> οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας  
 ἄλλο διέκρινεν φιλέοντέ τε τερπομένω τε  
 πρίν γ' ὅτε δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφοκάλυψεν.



As a novelty, Weber cites the occurrence of an opt. with *ὅπως* after an historical present. When one reflects that the historical present is excluded from the epic, the novelty loses its great importance. Under the incomplete final sentence we find *ὅπως* with the fut., Ag. 847, Suppl. 410; *ὥς* with opt., Pr. 203; and *ὅπως* with the fut. indicative in the imperative sense, so familiar in Attic Greek. There is no definite ellipsis. For examples, see L. and S., 7 ed., s. v. *ὅπως*.<sup>1</sup>

Paratactic *μή* occurs 20 times in SOPHOKLES. The 18 subjunctives (2 pres, 15 aor., one alternating) follow principal, the two aor. opt. secondary tenses. The final sentence is found with an interrogative, Ai. 77: *τί μή γένηται*; El. 1276: *τί μή ποιήσω*; in sentences of fear (19 passages) we have *μή* (16), *ὅπως μή* (1), *ὥς* (2). There is no *μή οὐ*. The sequence of *μή* is the regular prose sequence.

Two passages, however, give trouble:

Ai. 278: *ξύμφημι δὴ σοι καὶ δέδοικα μή 'κ θεοῦ  
πληγὴ τις ἦκοι* (so La.; the choice lies between *ἦκει*  
and *ἦκη*).

Trach. 550: *ταῦτ' οὖν φοβοῦμαι μή πόσις μὲν Ἡρακλῆς  
ἐμὸν καλεῖται* (so La., others *καλῆται*), *τῆς νεωτέρας δ'  
ἀνῆρ*.

Elmsley writes *ἦκει* because the blow has already fallen, but, as has been said before, the pres. subj. of ascertainment may be used (after a verb of fear) as well as action. Weber takes *καλεῖται* as a future, with Hermann.

*Μή* with opt. and *ἄν* after a verb of fear is a Sophoklean extension (Trach. 630), and though it really gives very little trouble, it may be worth remarking that the use of the opt. and *ἄν* with *μή* is not satisfactorily stated in the text-books, as, for instance, the difference between *πῶς οὐκ ἄν εἶη*, and *πῶς μή ἄν εἶη*.<sup>2</sup> Sophokles further uses *ὥς* with the fut. after a verb of fear in which *ὥς* introduces an object sentence, just as we use familiarly 'that' instead of 'lest.' In both instances, El. 1309, 1426, a negative sentence precedes.

Of the twelve examples of the incomplete final sentence in Sophokles, three, El. 580: *ὄρα μή τιθῆς*, 584 *εἰσόρα μή τιθῆς*, Phil. 30:

<sup>1</sup> Original form of that article: 'The consciousness of any original ellipsis is often effaced with the second person, as is shown by the close combination with the imperative, where there is no breathing space (*ἐμβα χῶπως ἀρεῖς*, Ar. Ran. 377).'

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Plato Gorg. 510 D; Legg. 10, 887 C.



ὄρα μὴ κυρῆ, the question may fairly be asked whether we are to read *τίθης* or *τιθῆς*, *κυρῆ* or *κυρεῖ*.

The following table shows Sophokles' use of the final particles in the complete final sentence:

	<i>ἵνα</i>	<i>ὅπως</i>	<i>ὅπως ἂν</i>	<i>ὥς αν</i>	<i>ὥς</i>	
O. R.	3	2			6	11
O. C.	5	3	1	1	11	21
Ant.	2	3			4	9
Ai.		4		1	10	15
El.		11	1	1	7	20
Trach.	1	5			7	13
Philokt.	3	3		2	7	15
	<hr/> 14	<hr/> 31	<hr/> 2	<hr/> 5	<hr/> 52	<hr/> 104

In Sophokles *ὥς* dominates except in the *Electra*, where *ὅπως* leads, *ἵνα* comes more to the front. The impure final sentences retreat. It does not seem possible to get any characteristic out of these facts, which are facts and nothing more.

Unreal *ἵνα* occurs O. R. 1387, unreal *ὅπως* El. 1131, unreal *ὥς* O. R. 1391. The future is seldom used in the final sentence proper (O. C. 1724).

The impure final sentences occur only after principal tenses, and take the subjunctive alone. Look upon *ὥς ἂν* and *ὅπως ἂν* as a manner of *ἦν πως*, and the fact will not be surprising. Not to reproduce all of Weber's figures, it is only necessary to say that the sequence in Sophokles is fairly normal. The opt. is followed by the subj. (Trach. 1109), instead of the opt. This would seem to indicate that the opt. here is imperative in its character.

A curious phrase is first found in Sophokles, *δεῖ σ' ὅπως πατρὸς δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς*, Ai. 556, cf. Phil. 54. The explanation given by Weber is that of a doubly urgent demand, *δεῖ σε*, 'thou must,' *ὅπως δείξεις*, 'be sure to show,' *ὅπως* being only apparently dependent on *δεῖ*, so that we should have a blending of two constructions, *δεῖ σε δείξαι*, and *ὅπως δείξεις*. This once favorite mode of explanation is not so much resorted to now. The simple principle would seem to be that such confusions should not be allowed within narrow compass unless there is evident excitement. When the tone is passionate we may expect a want of sequence in the utterance, and the main objection to this explanation here is that the tone is too quiet, both in the passages cited and in Kratinos (2, p. 82, Mein.), the only three instances in the language.

The imperative *ὅπως* with the future, so common, as we shall see, in Aristophanes, occurs but once in Sophokles (O. R. 1518).

Paratactic *μή*, according to Weber, occurs 49 times in EURIPIDES.<sup>1</sup> The aor. subj. largely preponderates. Noteworthy is Phoen. 92, where the ind. is followed by the subj., apprehension of a present state by apprehension of a future result.

The verbs of fear widen their sphere in Euripides. A hint is sometimes enough to bring about the equivalence. So Ion 685, Andr. 142, El. 902. Sometimes there is no dependence, *e. g.* Tro. 982: *μή οὐ πείσης σοφούς*. In Hipp. 518: *δέδοιχ' ὅπως μοι μή λίαν φανῆς σοφή*, and I. T. 995: *τὴν θεὸν ὅπως λάθω δέδοικα καὶ τύραννον*, the *εἴ πως* element of *ὅπως*, mentioned above, explains the extension. Euripides makes use of *μή οὐ*, Aischylos and Sophokles did not, but it is impossible to see any significance in this, or in the *τί μή γένηται* which Euripides indulges in as well as Sophokles. The predominance of the aor. tenses here also is perfectly natural. The larger numbers in Euripides, however, make it worth noting that there is not the same disproportion between aor. subj. and aor. opt. as was emphasized in Homer.

The 'incomplete' or complementary final sentence (after *ὅρα* and the like) shows indicatives in three passages, (imperf.) Hel. 119, (pres. perf.) Or. 208, (pres.) Ion. 1523.

The table of the occurrences of the final particles of all the plays shows that in Euripides, as in Aischylos and Sophokles, *ὥς* leads. This is also true of the single plays, with the exception of the Herakleidai, in which *ὅπως* predominates; but the number of final sentences in that play is only four, and arguing on so narrow a basis would be unreasonable, as Weber himself admits.

	<i>Aischylos.</i>	<i>Sophokles.</i>	<i>Euripides.</i>
<i>ὥς</i>	34	57	210
<i>ὅπως</i>	17	33	26
<i>ἵνα</i>	2	14	71

The advance in *ἵνα* might be set down to Euripides' nearer approach to prose; but that would not account for the neglect of *ὅπως*, which is also prosaic; so that we have not an organic fact here such as was recognized elsewhere in the use of *εἰ* with fut. ind. and of the articular infinitive. The bulk of Euripides, taking in the Rhesus, is two and a half times as great as that of Sophokles. If the usage

<sup>1</sup> Rhesus is excluded.

of Sophokles were identical with that of Euripides, we should have for the same bulk approximately  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  142,  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  83,  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$  35, which brings out the discrepancy very clearly.

The impure final sentence  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  gains in Euripides. It stands to the pure final sentence as 34 : 272, as 1 : 8. In Sophokles it is as 1 : 14, in Aischylos as 1 : 2. What conclusion is to be drawn from this retrogression does not appear.

The negatived final particles,  $\iota\upsilon\alpha \mu\grave{\eta}$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \mu\grave{\eta}$ , and so on, are not quite so common as what we have been calling paratactic  $\mu\grave{\eta}$  (40 : 49), but paratactic  $\mu\grave{\eta}$  has fallen back as compared with Sophokles;  $\iota\upsilon\alpha \tau\acute{\iota}$  comes in with Aristophanes;  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\acute{\iota}$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\acute{\iota} \delta\eta$  with Euripides.

From an examination of the sequence of moods and tenses in Euripides, Weber draws the important conclusion that Euripides differs from Aischylos, Sophokles, and Aristophanes in the use of the subjunctive after the past tense, even when the design is recognized as past.

According to Weber, Euripides is not satisfied with the ordinary categories: (1) Gnostic aor., practically a principal tense; (2) Retention of *oratio recta*; (3) The action still prospective. But the second category can be stretched to hold all the uses of Euripides, and it is going too far to say that in tragedy the approach to the point of view of Herodotos is due to Euripides. It must be remembered that the subjunctive is the original final and in later Greek survived the opt., which, in this class of sentences, is due to a certain adaptation. The last to come is the first to perish, as often.

The subj. after the pure opt. of wish in Euripides is assured by the metre in Suppl. 620, where it is in a nest of opt. and  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , the regular sequence of which is the subj.

The opt. after principal tenses disappears on inspection, and the impure final sentence with  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu$  always has the subj., always follows a principal tense.

The unreal sequence occurs seven times, five times with  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ , twice with  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ .

The imperative  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  with fut. indic. occurs six times in Euripides.

ARISTOPHANES has no  $\mu\grave{\eta} \omicron\upsilon$  after a verb of fear, but the independent sentence of fear, or rather apprehension, is found with  $\mu\grave{\eta} \omicron\upsilon$ , Eccl. 794, where Heindorf reads  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta\varsigma$  and Blaydes makes half a dozen suggestions.

In Aristophanes,  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$  shoots up to even more than its prose height. 183 out of 243 complete final sentences have  $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ ,  $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$  has only 18,

ὥς a beggarly three, two of these in lyric and dialectic passages, Lys. 1265, 1305; the third, Eccl. 285, has been corrected *certatim*. Weber lets it stand.

The use of ἵνα τί has already been noticed in connexion with the ὥς τί of Euripides. The ellipsis is usually supplied by γένηται or γένοιτο, but it is better not to formulate. It has evidently come into use from everyday life, and is not due to the genius of any special author. Language is always renewing itself from below as well as from above. *Ut quid* in Latin, on the other hand, seems to be a mechanical translation of the Greek, to which it answers in the Vulgate.<sup>1</sup>

Ὅπως ἄν leads ὅπως (24 : 18), ὥς ἄν leads ὥς (15 : 3). The latter phenomenon is readily understood. Ὡς ἄν is not so much final as relative or conditional. Ὅπως and ἵνα are used so much alike in standard prose that they often alternate without any translatable difference. Ὅπως ἄν with the subjunctive is more circumstantial, more cautious. Wecklein (l. c.) has noticed that it is preferred in the *tituli honorarii*, and Weber sees in the large use of it in the *Lysistrata* a parody of official style.

Paratactic μή is used only 8 times. Ordinarily we have ἵνα μή (43), ὅπως μή (9). As to the sequence of tenses, the aor. subj. predominates over the pres., but the pres. opt. doubles the aor. opt., a puzzling phenomenon, encountered before.

The unreal indicative is found with ἵνα three times (imperf. twice, aor. once), with ὅπως once (imperf.).

It was not worth Weber's while to linger on the opt. sequence in Vesp. 109 and Eccl. 349, where the opt. is due to the historical tense of the participle. In Aves 1522 εἰσάγοιτο may be explained by a reference to the time of φασί. Prometheus is reporting what the barbarian gods said. So we find the opt. after a principal tense in *oratio obliqua* with the objective ὥς, Hdt. 1, 70; Thuk. 1, 38 al. (see Kühner, II 882; Kühnast, Repraesentation, s. 32). Φασί involves ἔφασαν as λέγουσι involves ἔλεγον. Familiar is Ranae 23:

αὐτὸς βαδίζω καὶ πονῶ, τοῦτον δ' ὀχῶ  
ἵνα μὴ ταλαιπωροῖτο μηδ' ἄχθος φέροι.

<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, Apol. I 40, 37. According to Sittl (Lokale Verschiedenheiten der lat. Sprache) *ut quid* is especially common in African Latinity. True, in Cicero Att. 7, 7, 7 we find Depugna, inquis, potius quam servias. *Ut quid?* Si victus eris, proscribere. But every one must feel that this *ut quid* is easier and more natural than in the Vulgate, where it heads a sentence and corresponds mechanically to the LXX ἵνα τί.

Weber gives it up as a bit of carelessness in Aristophanes himself. It is true that Reisig's 'Dionysus *voluisse* profitetur *ne laboraret*' seems forced, but the translation 'I have been letting him ride' does not. The ride extends from the time Dionysos gave Xanthos the mount.

The subjunctive after principal tenses occurs 13 times. There is an interesting shift from subj. to opt. in Lys. 371 sqq. Lenting reads *κατασβέσωμεν*, but *ἀφίκου*, which precedes, is a double-ender.

Peculiar to Aristophanes is the large use of *ὅπως* with the fut. in the 'complete' final sentence, always after a principal tense. That *ὥς ἂν* and *ὅπως ἂν* should be used only after a principal tense is but natural. The finer shading is lost in the transfer to the past.

In the incomplete final sentence (with verbs of ways and means, etc.), Aristophanes uses *ὅπως* twenty-one times with the fut., *ὅπως μή* three, the opt. twice, *ὅπως ἂν* with subj. six times.

The independent or imperative *ὅπως* sentence is very common in Aristophanes, as it must have been very common in conversation. The peculiarity in Aristophanes is, according to Weber, the 'weakening' of the fut. to a mere imperative, as is shown by the combination with the imperative. This at least is better than the nonsense one sometimes reads about the future as a mild form of the imperative. If one controls the action of another so as to predict it, one is absolute master, and the command is just such a command as is given to a slave. It is familiar, not mild.

A curious extension of *ὅπως μή* is found in Ach. 343: *ἀλλ' ὅπως μή 'ν τοῖς τρίβωσιν ἐγκάθηνται πονεῖς λίθοι*, which was not given in L. and S., 7 ed., simply because such oddities belong to the commentary rather than to the lexicon. Yet the omission is to be regretted.

At the close of the dramatic section Weber sums up.

(1) *ὅπως ἂν* introduced to the complete final sentence by Aischylos. (2) Advance of the future. Aischylos introduces it after sentences of fear. (3) Unreal construction with indic. introduced by Aischylos. (4) Independent *ὅπως* sentence introduced by Aischylos, developed by Aristophanes. (5) Indicative with *μή* in the incomplete final sentence. (6) The sentences of fear are blended with other kinds of sentences. (7) *ἵνα τί* (Ar.), *ὥς τί* (Eur.). (8) Extension of the antecessive position (*ἵνα*, *ὅπως* precedes). The following table shows the difference between tragic and comic syntax in the complete final sentence:

	ἵνα	ὅπως	ὅπως υν	ὥς	ὥς ἂν
Aisch.	2	11	6	23	11
Soph.	14	31	2	52	5
Eurip.	71	14	7	182	27
Aristoph.	183	18	24	3	15

This table shows the proportionate use of the different particles as measured by each other, but not as to the bulk of the author. Still it is sufficiently significant, though the most important fact that it brings out has long been the common property of students of Attic syntax.

### C. VI. *Ionic Prose Writers.*

In HERODOTOS, paratactic *μή* does not occur often—8 times in all. Verbs of fear are used freely, and with verbs of fear *μή οὐ*, which Weber considers to have suffered exile from Greek since the Homeric time,<sup>1</sup> a point of view that may lead to all manner of absurdities. Non-occurrence is not the proof of non-existence.

Herodotos also uses the independent sentence of fear with *μή οὐ* (5, 79), where *μή* is intellectual apprehension rather than moral fear.

The sequence of tenses is noteworthy. Of 42 examples we find (1) after principal tenses, the subjunctive nine times (pres. 2, aor. 7); after historical tenses, the opt. three times (pres. 1, aor. 2), but the subj. no less than 29 times. Herodotos, then, has broken through the rule, to the utter confusion of Weber, whose only explanation is simply a circumlocutory account of the phenomenon.<sup>2</sup> This is merely a matter of individual style, not of historical development. The subjunctive has a perfect right to follow an historical tense, and an author of Herodotos' plastic force would be apt to use it. In English, for instance, we sometimes use 'that he be' after a past tense instead of 'that he should be.' Can any one question which is the more forcible expression?

Weber cites, as a curiosity, the subj. [opt.] after the ind. with *ἄν* 8, 53: *οὐτ' ἂν ἥλπισε, μή κοτέ τις κατὰ ταῦτα ἀναβαίη*, as if it were some-

<sup>1</sup> Durch sie, Herodot und Euripides, wurde dieses *μή οὐ* in die griechische Sprache wieder eingebürgert.

<sup>2</sup> Als Erklärungsgrund kann hier nur geltend gemacht werden, dass die Abwehr lediglich durch den Hauptsatz in die Vergangenheit gerückt wird, in dem Satz, der das Abzuwehrende ausdrückt, bleibt die Vergangenheit unbezeichnet.



would be better to say a return to the older basis. Simplification would be a more appropriate expression when speaking of such a stage of the language as we encounter in the New Testament, where *ἵνα* with the opt. is unknown.

In regard to the incomplete final sentence *ὅπως* occurs with the future 24 times, after principal and after historical tenses, with the opt. after historical tenses or equivalents four times, with the subj. after historical tenses four times. *ὅπως ἄν* with the opt. after historical tenses four times, *ὥς* with the future three times, *ὥς ἄν* with the aor. subj. after a principal tense, 3, 85. Remarkable is the use of *ὅπως ἄν* with the subj. after an historical tense, 1, 20. Usually *repraesentatio* does not go into such details, and Herodotos' reproduction of the state of mind of Periander must be set down to the credit of his *ἐνάργεια*.<sup>1</sup> Imperative *ὅπως* occurs once (3, 142).

What Weber says of HIPPOKRATES does not rest on personal research of his own, and is too slight to bear abstracting. The most important point is the exclusive use of *ὥς* in complete final sentences.

The detailed abstract and the many comments above given must serve as the testimony of the reviewer to the importance of Weber's work. The final sentence is now, for the first time, presented in its chronological data. One may rebel against calling such work historical syntax, because we have really nothing more than a classification of occurrences, and it is taken for granted throughout, and sometimes, as has been indicated, without reason, that each author represents fully the thesaurus of his time. The personal equation is the great difficulty, and cannot be solved without a theory of the totality of syntactical phenomena in each author. Still such chronological statistics, such records of the behavior of certain particles in certain authors, in certain departments, in certain periods, are of great importance. Without them, a history of Greek syntax is impossible. Without them, a scientific theory of syntactical style is impossible. Without them, it is impossible to understand the course of later Greek, which, after all, has an organic life, though that organic life is of such complexity that even when the mastery of classic syntax is attained, generations of students will find work enough to do in exploring its processes and its diseases.

<sup>1</sup> Kühnast (Die Repraesentation, S. 153) notices the rarity of this *repraesentatio*, and indulges in unavailing and unavailable metaphysics about the difference between the 'objectivirte' and the 'objective Ausdrucksweise.' By the way, Weber has not made a solitary reference to Kühnast's elaborate work.



As soon as the second part of Dr. Weber's treatise reaches us, another study will be consecrated to the subject. Only, as has been said before, the Attic final sentence does not present the same difficulties as the early forms, although we shall have to encounter the troublesome question of the use of *ὅπως* with subj. and fut.

In conclusion, a serious gap must be noted in Weber's treatment of the final sentence—the omission of the relative form. While he admits that *ὅπως* is a relative, he is satisfied with giving Nägelsbach's six forms of the final relative in Homer (p. 64), without any comment except that the *ὅπως* form corresponding to *ὅς κεν εἴποι* is represented only in one passage (I 680), and that the form corresponding to *ὅς κεν ἐρεῖ* is doubtful (P 144). The study of the moods of the relative ought genetically to have preceded the study of this form of the final sentence.

Yet another form of the final sentence, the future participle, and the important outgrowth *ὥς* with the future participle, should not have been omitted. The latter construction is one of the most interesting in Greek, and should not be relegated altogether to the domain of *oratio obliqua*, though *oratio obliqua* is the only ultimate explanation of it.<sup>1</sup>

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, Apol. I 4, 19. The construction is often parallel with other final turns, as in Ar. Eccl. 782:

ἔστηκεν ἐκτείνοντα τὴν χεῖρ' ὑπτίαν  
οἱ χ' ὥς τι δώσουτ' ἀλλ' ὅπως τι λήψεται.

### III.—T. L. BEDDOES,<sup>1</sup> A SURVIVAL IN STYLE.

#### I.

Buffon said, "Show me the style and I'll show you the man" [*le style est de l'homme même*]. Puttenham (*Arte of English Poesie*, 1589, p. 161) wrote with equal justice: "his [man's] inward conceits be the metall of his minde, and his manner of utterance the very warp and woofe of his conceits"; or, in other words, "show me the man, and I'll show you his style."

<sup>1</sup> Born 1803, at Clifton, England; son of the Dr. Thos. Beddoes whose life was published by Dr. Stock, 1811. In 1825 he went to Germany, and, with the exception of a few transient visits to England, lived there, as a distinguished medical student and scholar, until his death at Basel in 1849. Twice he was recommended for the chair of medicine in two German universities, and Prof. Blumenbach, of Goettingen, declared him possessed of an amount of talent which exceeded that of every other student who had received instruction under him during the fifty years of his professorship. With the exception of "Death's Jest Book," B.'s chief drama, most of his poetry was written before his departure from England; and during the last twenty years of his life he neither produced much nor published. At his death he consigned his MSS to the disposal of his friend, T. F. Kelsall, "to print or not as he might think proper."

Kelsall's edition, accompanied by a very able Memoir, appeared in 1851 (London, W. Pickering), and is now very scarce. This fact, and the very meagre notices of Beddoes in books of reference, have seemed to make the foregoing particulars necessary. The following interesting judgments are added to show how little is known of Beddoes, and how well he deserves study: "His later dramatic compositions and fragments, though showing a certain vigorous and passionate thought, have an increasing tendency to exaggeration and extravagance, and are hardly amenable to the ordinary rules of criticism" (!). —J. M. Graham, *An Hist. View of Lit. and Art in Great Britain*, London, 1871, p. 191, note. "In 1850 appeared as a posthumous work a wild play, musical throughout, with grand echoes of Elizabethan thought and passion, the *Death's Jest Book* of Thomas Lovell Beddoes, who died young in 1849."—H. Morley, *Engl. Plays*, p. 434. "Nearly two centuries have elapsed since a work of the same wealth of genius as *Death's Jest Book* hath been given to the world."—W. S. Landor, in *Forster's Life of L.* II 495. "Now as to extracts which might be made: why, you might pick out scenes, passages, lyrics, fine as fine can be; the power of the man is immense and irresistible."—Robert Browning, *Letter to T. F. Kelsall*.

Beddoes' Poems and Letters are one more welcome illustration of the truth of Buffon's observation; but, in a far higher sense, of Puttenham's. Here the style is the direct, necessary expression of the writer's inmost nature. Since he was in the highest degree original, the fact has a significance, in matters of English style, far deeper than has been attributed to it.

The Natural History of English Style remains to be written. Meanwhile, the path by which its chief laws may be traced out and confirmed must traverse the works of those authors who were original *and national*; who, if they borrowed, assimilated matter and manner as well to a certain *Volksgeist* as to their own genius; and who were all, in a greater or less degree, the natural heirs, the opulent users and transmitters, of what might be called the residuum of English expression. It is not likely that many English poets, from Cynewulf down, were conscious of exercising any such vestal office, but this very unconsciousness renders the facts and the value of them more unimpeachable. Shakspeare's dramas and Milton's *Comus* offer very valuable material for the study of alliteration in English, though the former ridicules its abuse (*Mids. N. D.* I 2; *Love's L. L.* IV 2, etc.), and the latter, while explicit enough as to "the invention of a barbarous age to set off wretched matter and lame metre" [rhyme], does not mention alliteration in his definition of "true musical delight" (*Introd. to Par. Lost*).

If we class the characteristic works in English literature with reference to the history of style into three periods, the Anglo-Saxon epic style and Shakspeare represent two of them. The third has no complete representative, but among its most significant writers (style being here assumed to have little more to do with constructive power than in the case of the Anglo-Saxon poets) is Thomas Lovell Beddoes.

Beddoes' intimate connection with Shakspeare, in point of thought and style, is so marked that he has been called an Elizabethan, "a strayed singer," and the like. His more general relation to the historical development of English literature and style has been perceived only dimly.

The *Encycl. Brit.*, 10th ed., article Beddoes, says: "He may be termed a Gothic Keats, the Teutonic counterpart of his more celebrated contemporary's Hellenism. The spirit of Gothic architecture seems to live in his verse, its grandeur and grotesqueness, its mystery and gloom." Beddoes himself calls *Death's Jest Book* "a Gothic-styled tragedy," and Kelsall, his biographer, I cxxi,

"the Gothic drama." Remembering the 18th century definition, or lack of definition, of the word Gothic, the following notices are more satisfactory: "I intend to study Anglo-Saxon soon" (Letters, p. lxxv); "He never revisited Italy, and he certainly was seldom in France; the national characters, modes of thinking, and literatures of those peoples not being accordant with his mind, *which was altogether Teutonic*" (Kelsall, I cxii). The discriminating biographer of Beddoes reaches here a truth which even he fails to discern and apply when speaking directly of B.'s style. The object of this article is to show that his style is Germanic (Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic), that it is Shakspearian, and (what follows from the foregoing) that it contains the chief elements of the historical English style.

The ideal English style for the epic, and for the tragic drama, is confessedly a weighty one. The word, as well as the thought, must clash down in the scales. Anglo-Saxon poetry is a series of such hammer-strokes, as it were. The disconnectedness (partly induced by paratactic construction) is sometimes intolerable to a modern ear; but the immense advantage of a modified style of that character is very apparent in the enormous force gained from the sudden fling of Shakspearian metaphors. It is very plain that *strong* figures are the corner-stone of style, but especially of English style. There is, however, a difficulty at the outset in comparing any strong English style with Anglo-Saxon. The A. S. epic-lyric poetry is very subjective, and works through the feelings upon the feelings in the strongest manner. Shakspeare, though bound to no device in style, and touching all keys, delights to work chiefly through the pictures of a glowing imagination upon the kindling imagination of the hearer. With him the action upon the feelings is not least powerful when indirect. The deficiency in A. S. shows itself in unprecise figures of speech, or in sufficiently precise but fragmentary epithets, now varied and now doubling upon themselves. The force spent in figures is astounding,<sup>1</sup> but we do not seem to get on. The tone, powerful though it is, becomes elegiac, almost passive. Heinzel (*Ueber den Stil der altgerman. Poesie*, Strassburg, 1875) and Gummere (*The Anglo-Saxon Metaphor*, Halle, 1881) have shown that Christian influence is at work here; an influence, however, which Gummere has convincingly shown to be limited in its operation. A. Hoff-

<sup>1</sup> The adjective *heard* occurs 12 times in *Byrhtnōð*.

mann (Der bildliche Ausdruck im Beowulf und in der Edda, Englische Studien, VI 163-216) is of the opinion that the Old-Norse, which is notoriously rich in similes, while A. S. is not, has been able to develop them because the Norse poets aimed at a living and concrete presentation of what they had to tell, and realized this through figures of speech, and especially through the simile. But Gummere is undoubtedly right in asserting that the Anglo-Saxon did not use the simile more, because he had not time for such balanced and leisure utterance (see also ten Brink, Gesch. der Engl. Lit. 24). But this is completely true only of the fully expressed, developed simile. The latter figure, more especially when combined with metaphor, is nearly as natural a vehicle of hurrying thought as the metaphor pure and simple. Our American (humorous) slang is a witness to its energy. Hegel also has shown (Aesthetik, I 536) that many of Shakspeare's similes are effective even in the most moving situations and in high excitement. A chief characteristic of the simile, apparently not noticed by Heinzel and Gummere, is that it addresses itself to the understanding and the imagination primarily (Hegel defines the object of the simile to be "die klar vor Bewusstsein stehende Bedeutung in der Gestalt einer verwandten Aeusserlichkeit zu veranschaulichen," cited by Marheineke in Herrig's Archiv, LI 174). The metaphor may work upon these primarily, but it has in serious poetry usually a distinct element of feeling. The metaphor is warm; it absorbs and gives out heat, whether of feeling or imagination. The simile is diaphanous, scintillating, a glancing aside; it reflects the light of the intellect cast upon it.

How far a subjective style, proceeding directly from and to the feelings, is an original characteristic of A. S. poetry, must be left to more searching investigations than have yet been made. The elegiac character would seem inherent in the race. The cuckoo is a bringer of sad thoughts to the A. S., of joyful thoughts to the German. Melancholy has been said by an acute observer (Brandes, Hauptströmungen der Literatur des 19 Jahrhunderts, I 59 ff.) to be a matter of *raisonnement* with the French, but of temperament with the English. Many A. S. poems, many early incidents and anecdotes, would seem to confirm this view. And yet we find the second period of bloom in English literature—the Elizabethan—uniting those characteristics which have been shown to favor both the metaphor and that variety of the simile which unites clearness, conciseness, and power. Nor have the conditions

changed since, except that as the literature lost in intensity, the simile gained upon the metaphor, and itself lost in compactness. The Elizabethan style can be shown to represent, in the main, the national English style in all periods. It is also at least probable that an early dramatic tendency in A. S. literature would have brought with it a freer use of the simile, and that the whole character of it, as regards the use of figures, would have been an embryonic Elizabethan. It is far more probable that every succeeding return to true dramatic writing in English will show a recurrence to the character of his writing who is English of the English—Shakspeare.

The preceding discussion has made it possible to define Beddoes' style more narrowly. In his use of *Kennings* he is, on the whole, more Anglo-Saxon than Shakspeare, and perhaps more brilliant than any poet since Shakspeare. In the relative use of simile and metaphor he differs scarcely from Shakspeare, and approaches very near the ideal that Whately sets up (Rhet. Pt. III, Ch. II, §3): "Where the case will not admit of pure metaphor, generally prefer a mixture of metaphor and simile; first pointing out the similitude, and afterwards employing metaphorical terms which imply it; or *vice versa*, explaining a metaphor by a statement of the comparison." There is scarcely a tedious or a lame simile in the whole of Beddoes' works. In the character and quality of his metaphors B. is not less forcible, unlabored, and beautiful than Shakspeare, but he is far less many-sided, and often less judicious. Other minor points will be mentioned in order.

*Beddoes' relation to Shakspeare and to his own age.*

Of English authors, Beddoes was intimate only with Barry Cornwall. Among his contemporaries he admired chiefly Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats; but "his admiration and delight fully rested in Shelley alone." Shakspeare he worshipped.

"Shakspeare was an incarnation of nature, and you might just as well attempt to remodel the seasons, and the laws of life and death, as to alter 'one jot or tittle' of his eternal thoughts. . . He was an universe; and all material existence, with its excellencies and defects, was reflected in shadowy thought upon the crystal waters of his imagination, ever-glorified as they were by the sleepless sun of his golden intellect. And this imaginary universe had its seasons and changes, its harmonies and its discords, as well as the dirty reality; on the snow-maned necks of its winter hurricanes rode madness, despair, and 'empty death, with the winds whistling through the white grating of his

sides'; its summer of poetry, glistening through the drops of pity; and its solemn and melancholy autumn, breathing deep melody among the sere and yellow leaves of thunder-stricken life." Letter, March 3, 1824.

"These are the honey-minutes of the year,  
Which make man god, and make a god—Shakspeare."

Letter from Oxford, 1825.

"Witness kind Shakspeare, our recording angel." Lines written in Switzerland (I 215).

"To my mind the only error of the Cenci is that its splendid author seemed to have the Greeks, instead of Shakspeare, as his model in his mind's eye." Letter, Nov. 21, 1823.

"Not in the age, but in the spirit of his verse, written after their grand manner, was he of the brotherhood of our Elizabethan worthies." T. F. Kelsall in Fortn. Rev. XVIII 51.

"Is it not really a ridiculous fact, that, of all our modern dramatists, none . . . has approached, in any degree, to the form of play delivered to us by the founders of the stage? All—from Massinger and Shirley down to Shiel and Knowles—more or less French. The people are in this case wiser than the critics." Letter, February, 1829.

And yet Beddoes will be no imitator, nor Shakspeare reviver.

"I am convinced the man who is to awaken the drama must be a bold trampling fellow, no creeper into wormholes, no reviver even, however good . . . With the greatest reverence for all the antiquities of the drama [he refers to Marlowe, Webster, etc.], I still think we had better beget than revive, attempt to give the literature of this age an idiosyncrasy and spirit of its own, and only raise a ghost to gaze on, not to live with. Just now the drama is a haunted ruin." Letter, January, 1825.

"He borrowed nothing, either from his Elizabethan precursors, or the chief objects of his admiration among his contemporaries, Keats and Shelley." Encyc. Brit., 10th ed., article Beddoes.

While B.'s language seems to possess all the elements of the Shakspearian, there is no trace of the consciously antique in it, not even a single instance of "Marry, a parlous child," or the like. Once only, in the Bride's Tragedy, written while he was still a minor, an antique phrase occurs: "her cheeks with grief ybrined." I 1.

Intimately connected with Beddoes' remarks on Shakspeare, and important in the matter of his affinities in style, is his opinion of his own writings:

"I read Shakspeare and Wordsworth . . . and doubt, and seem to myself a very Bristol diamond," I xcii. "I begin to prefer anatomy to poetry, I mean to my own, . . . besides, I never could have been the real thing as a writer. There *shall* be no more accurate physiologist and dissector," I lvi. "I would



really not give a shilling for anything I have written, nor sixpence for anything I am likely to write," I lxxvii (1827). "Such verses as these, and their brethren, will never be preserved to be pasted on the inside of the coffin of our planet," I lxxviii. "Such doggrell" [Death's Jest Book], I lv. "I open my own page, and see at once what d—d trash it all is—no truth or feeling. . . I thank heaven that I am settling down pretty steadily to medical studies; labour there can do almost all," I lvii. "He [Procter] is only about as much too brief as I am too long-winded. . . My cursed fellows in the Jest Book would palaver immeasurably, and I could not prevent them," I lxxix. "[This] age of crockery," I lxi. "Here . . . in Melpomene's sepulchre in Germany," I lix. "Moore's song style is the best *false* one I know, and glitters like broken glass," I xc.

Kelsall (I xxiii) thinks that B.'s Pygmalion is "the sole instance of a direct impress from another mind, in the whole compass of his poetry." Absolutely none have been found in Death's Jest Book, and the following reminiscences of Shakspeare in the earlier pieces are the scanty gleanings of all the labor in this direction :

Second Brother, I 2 (Vol. I, pp. 16-17) [too long to quote], cf. Macbeth, III 3, 40-120.

Bride's Tragedy, II 2 (Vol. I 204):

"He is the glass of all good qualities."

cf. Hamlet, III 1, 161; 2 Hen. IV, II 3, 21, 31.

Bride's Tragedy, II 4 (I 220-1), cf. the monologue of Hesperus with Macbeth, II 1, 33 ff.

*Ibid.* III 2 (I 232):

"Thou that with dew-cold finger softly closest  
The wearied eye; thou sweet, thou gentle power,  
Soother of woe, sole friend of the oppressed."

cf. Macbeth, II 2, 37.

It must be remembered that the Bride's Tragedy was written when Beddoes was 19 years old.

### *Beddoes' Epithets, Kennings.<sup>1</sup>*

Among B.'s early memoranda, "made for his own guidance in the mechanics of dramatic art," occur the words: "Marstonic lines for Melchior; metaphors of hell, lower animals; try the effect of using no epithets," I xxi. This was the exception with Beddoes. He employs the epithet with the large freedom of the A. S. poet, and with unsurpassed skill. "The poet's (*i. e.* Beddoes') magic is in the web of his verse; and penetrating every portion of its

<sup>1</sup> O. N. Kenningar = descriptive names, synonyms.



texture, it makes its presence felt in his most fragmentary compositions, in single lines, and often in mere epithets." Keisail.

*The Moon.* This wife for a month of the earth (Letters, lviii); of the O. E. "Adam's grandmother," in the earth. The primrose-sandal'd moon (Sec. Bro. I 1). That wolf-howled, witch-prayed, owl-sung fool, fat mother moon (Death's Jest Book, III 3). The ashes of moon's beams (moonlight) (D. J. B. I 105).

*Star.* Stingy star-shine (D. J. B. III 3). Star-bellied lightning (Sec. Bro. II 2). The unshaven Nazarine of stars (comet) unbinds his woodcock locks (S. B. III 1); of Shakspeare 1 Hen. VI, I 1. 3. and Webster (White Devil, V 1), rough-bearded comet. Star-mailed cloud (Vol. I 114). My love-consumed increase star (his wife, who died in childbirth) (D. J. B. III 3). Increase comes, or came, into the market in round, reddish-yellow pellets of hazel-nut size. Star-numbered crosses (numberless) (D. J. B. II 2). The tale of night, with its star-tipped billows bright (I 27). Night—her breast o'erworn with golden secretaries (I 135). With the foregoing compare the following from Shakspeare: All you fiery oes and eyes of light (M. N. D. III 2 188). Look, how the floor of heaven is til'd with patches of bright gold (M. of V. V 1. 35). Night's candles are burnt out (R. & J. III 3. 3). These blessed candles of the night (M. of V. V 1 22). There's husbandry in heaven, their candles are all out (Mach. II 1. 4). Of the Anglo-Saxon epithets for the sun: *den-candel* Riches. 88<sup>th</sup>; *den-scene*, Ex. 79; *weder-candel* (Acht. 372). The spots of heaven were fiery by night's blackness (A. & C. I 4. 12). The cankers of the element (2 Hen. IV. IV 3. 57). Diana's waiting women (Tit. & Cr. V 2. 91).

*Earth.* This grave-paved star (D. J. B. III 3). A hoary, atheistic, murderous star (D. J. B. II 2). Hell-borne bastard of the sun (D. J. B. II 2). the metaphor = hell-containing: Beelshes never throws away adjectives. This sepulchral planet (D. J. B. I 1); similar to the preceding. This dear planet of wool and leather [of people requiring clothing] (D. J. B. III 3); of Old-Norse wind-kers betta [boat beneath the wind-cup] (Vigfusson, Corpus Poeticum Scand. II 436).

*Natural Phenomena, etc.* The semi-eternal story populace of the planet (old towers) (Letters, lx). Noah's world-washing shower (Deluge) (D. J. B. III 3). Forest-powdering winds (Sec. Bro. II 1). The labyrinthine winds (S. B. I 2). Mute-mocking air (ghost) (S. B. III 3). Branch-dividing, light noon air (S. B.

III 2). In the mead, nightingale-nested (S. B. I 2). Sheep-specked pastures (S. B. I 2). Storm-souled fleets (D. J. B. III 3). The palace-banked streets [of arched Grüssau] (D. J. B. II 2). Tiny thunderer of flowers [bee] (Torrismund, I 3). The bee, in pied velvet dight (Bri. Trag. I 1). That winged song, the restless nightingale (B. T. I 1). The Danaë of flowers, with gold uphoarded on its virgin lap [daisy] (B. T. I 1). The blue violet, like Pandora's eye, when first it darkened with immortal life (B. T. I 1). A kiss-coloured rose (D. J. B. II 2). The sea-wide grave (Sec. Bro. II 2). Ghost-gaping (Letters, xxxviii). Arches and their caves, now double-nighted with heaven's and that creeping darkness, ivy (D. J. B. III 3). The caved Triton's azure day [sea] (D. J. B. I 1); cf. the following Anglo-Saxon and Old-Norse kennings for the sea: *fāmȝe feldas* (E. 287), *ganotes bæð* (B. 1861), *fiscas bæð* (Andr. 293), *yða ful* [beaker of waves] (B. 1208), *fāmiȝ bōsma* (E. 493), *seȝl-rād* (B. 1429), *swan rād* (B. 200), *hron rād* (G. 205), *laȝu stræt* (B. 239), *ȝeofenes beȝanȝ* (B. 362), *flōda beȝonȝ* (B. 1497), *wæteres hrycȝ* (B. 471), *ēȝor here* (G. 1537), *merehūses mūð* (G. 1362), *brim lād* (B. 1051), *wætres brōga* (G. 1395), *gār secȝ* [the rager; see H. Sweet in Engl. Stud. II 314 ff.] (G. 117), *blá-mœr* (Vigfusson, II 457), *Rán-himin* (II 470), and the following additional O. N. kennings for objects in nature, etc.: *vind-hialmr* [sky, wind-helmet] (II 457), *vind-flot* [wind-floe, cloud] (II 457), *ár-tali* [year-teller, moon] (II 454), *unda-bý* [wound-bees, arrows] (II 484), *kald-nefr* [cold neb, anchor] (II 458); cf. Shaksp. The babbling gossip of the air [echo] (Tw. N. I 5, 292); Rich scarf to my proud earth [rainbow] (Temp. IV 1, 82).

*Time.* Life, that glassy interval twixt us and nothing (Vol. I, 111). The shadow of Rome's death [Middle Ages] (Letters, lxx). Sword-straight, and poison-quick [good instance of B.'s preference of metaphor to simile, as quicker]. The world-sanded eternity (D. J. B. III 3).

*Man.* This deserted human engine [man in despair] (D. J. B. II 3). The bloody, soul-possessed weed, called man (D. J. B. III 3). This crime-haired head (D. J. B. IV 3). Brutus, thou saint of the avenger's order (D. J. B. I 1). Plead . . . with a tongue love-oiled (D. J. B. IV 1). [You] have a heart that's Cupid's arrow-cushion, worn out with use (D. J. B. II 2). This chrysalis of Psyche (D. J. B. IV 4). A prison, a dismal ante-chamber of the tomb, where creatures dwell, whose ghosts but

half inhabit their ruinous flesh-houses (Bri. Tr. I 3); cf., especially with the last two instances: *sâwle-hord* (B. 2422), *sâwel hûs* (Guth. 1003), *feorh hûs* (Byrhtn. 297), *lîc hama* (Crist 628), *bân hûs* (B. 3147), *ferhð loca* (E. 267), *bréost loca* (D. 167), *bân hringas* (B. 1567), *ferhð cōfa* (G. 2603), *bréost cōfa* (G. 574), *mun-strönd* [breast, shore of the mind] (Vigfusson, II 452), *svefna-ker* [eyelids, cups of sleep] (II 452), *tára-vellir* [eye, cauldron of tears] (II 452; see also II 450 for further explanation of the figure), *val-dögg* [blood, wound-dew] (II 484); cf. further in Shakspeare: This gap of breath [mouth] (K. John, III 4, 32); The anvil of my sword [my enemy] (Coriol. IV 5, 116); This foolish-compounded clay, man (2 Hen. IV, I 28).

*Abstract.* Swan-necked obedience (S. B. III 1). War, the spear-maned dragon (S. B. III 1). Humbleness, the lark that climbs heaven's stairs, but lives upon the ground (S. B. II 2). Glass oaths (Torrism. I 2). The meek and twilight-loving eye of lone religion (Bri. Tr. I 3). Prim Conscience's old tailor, Hypocrisy (B. T. IV 1). The Plague, the spotted fiend, the drunkard of the tomb (Vol. I, 145). The body-bursting spirit's yearnings (D. J. B. III 3); cf. *Him wæs ȝéomor sefa, wæfre and wælfûs* (Beow. 2419). Rehearsing death [sleep] (D. J. B. III 3); cf. Shakspeare, O sleep, thou ape of death (Cymb. II 2, 31), and O. N. *draum-þing* [sleep, parliament of dreams] (Vigfusson, II 457).

A further search for characteristic epithets in the authors of the Elizabethan age, and even in the works of modern poets, would doubtless yield many good ones; e. g. Sir Ph. Sidney (Sonn. lxx), Grief but Love's wintry livery is; and Shelley (Cenci, 468), That palace-walking devil, Gold; and especially Keats, as in *Hyperion*, B. I.: Those green-robed senators of mighty woods, tall oaks, branch-charmed by earnest stars, dream, and so dream all night without a stir. This last has, as might be expected, epic fulness, as contrasted with Shakspeare's and Beddoes' nervous dramatic energy. But probably neither Keats, nor Beddoes (Anglo-Saxon though he is), nor any other English writer, has anything so extraordinarily Anglo-Saxon as Shakspeare's "anvil of my sword" for "my enemy." Webster's "A politician is the devil's quilted anvil," is different (Duchess of Malfi, III 2). A careful reading of several later and contemporary poets, with this very point in view, again brings out the fact that in no matter of detail are the genius and art of the poet more perceptible and nicely balanced than in

the use of epithets. Only a few English writers have reached the energy and excellence of the A. S. in this. Beddoes is probably the most distinguished example since Shakspeare. Audacity alone cannot produce fine intense metaphor. Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* is an instance. He escapes into Spanish or maudlin as soon as his very limited metaphor-condensing power is exceeded. The dictionaries of the English dialects contain many good examples, and so does English slang-speech. But in both cases the anonymous framers have worked in the same line of thought as the Anglo-Saxon folk-poets. The A. S. and Shakspearian epithets, together with those of Beddoes, are the very "axles of thought, kindling with swiftness," and roll on quite too fast for many a modern poet's introspective amble.

HENRY WOOD.

[*To be continued.*]

#### IV.—NOTES.

##### JOHN EVELYN'S PLAN FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

To the student of XVIIth century literature or history, there are few more attractive and suggestive works than the Correspondence of John Evelyn. His letters embrace almost every feature of contemporary life, social, political, educational, and literary. Whether attesting his devotion to his fallen master, or commenting upon the judgments of God as displayed in the butchery of the regicides, approving the merciless punishment inflicted upon Titus Oates, or speculating upon British antiquities, he is uniformly genial, frequently instructive, rarely prolix. Among the great variety of topics touched by Evelyn's versatile pen, was "the improvement of the English tongue." He has left on record a scheme devised by him as "Chairman of a committee appointed by the now organized Royal Society, to consider of the improvement of the English tongue," see Evelyn's Correspondence, Vol. III 159-62, Letter to Sir Peter Wyche, 1665. Much of the peculiar interest of Evelyn's scheme is derived from the circumstance that some of his recommendations anticipated by nearly two centuries changes in orthography, which have either been actually adopted or strongly urged by leading lexicographers and phonetists in our own day. This remark applies with especial force to the dropping of the *u* in such words as *honour*; and the leaving off of the *ugh* in the word *though*, one of the specific changes suggested by a special committee upon the reform of our spelling, appointed several years ago under the auspices of the American Philological Association.

After a somewhat elaborate introduction, abounding in self-depreciation and conventional civilities, Evelyn proceeds to set forth his scheme as follows:

"I conceive the reason, both of additions to and corruptions of the English language, as of most other tongues, has proceeded from the same causes; namely, from victories, plantations, frontiers, staples of commerce, pedantry of schools, affectation of travellers,

translations, fancy and style of court, vernility and mincing of citizens, pulpits, political remonstrances, theatres, shops, etc.

“The parts affected with it we find to be the accent, analogy, direct interpretation, tropes, phrases, and the like.

“I. I would, therefore, humbly propose that there might first be compiled a grammar for the precepts, which (as did the Romans when Crates transferred the art to that city, followed by Diomedes, Prisciannus, and others who undertook it) might only insist on the rules, the sole means to render it a learned and learnable tongue.

“II. That with this a more certain orthography were introduced, as by leaving out superfluous letters, etc.; such as *o* in *woomen*, *people*; *u* in *honour*; *a* in *reproach*; *ugh* in *though*, etc.

“III. That there might be invented some new periods and accents, besides such as our grammarians and critics use, to assist, inspirit, and modify the pronunciation of sentences, and to stand as marks beforehand how the voice and tone is to be governed; as in reciting of plays, reading of verses, etc., for the varying the tone of the voice, and affections, etc.

“IV. To this might follow a lexicon or collection of all the pure English words by themselves; then those which are derivative from others, with their prime, certain, and natural signification; then the symbolical, so as no innovation might be used or favored, at least till there should arise some necessity of providing a new edition, and of amplifying the old upon mature advice.

“V. That in order to this, some were appointed to collect all the technical words, especially those of the more generous employments, as the author of the ‘*Essaies des Merveilles de la Nature, et des plus nobles Artifices*’ has done for the French, and Francis Junius and others have endeavored for the Latin; but this must be gleaned from shops, not books, and has been of late attempted by Mr. Moxon.

“VI. That things difficult to be translated or expressed, and such as are, as it were, incommensurable one to another, as determinations of weights and measures; coins, honors, national habits, arms, dishes, drinks, municipal constitutions of courts, old and abrogated customs, etc., were better interpreted than as yet we find them in dictionaries, glossaries, and noted in the lexicon.

“VII. That a full catalogue of exotic words, such as are daily minted by our *Logodaedali*, were exhibited, and that it were resolved on what should be sufficient to render them current, *ut civitate donentur*; since without restraining that same *indomitam*

*novandi verba licentiam*, it will in time quite disguise the language. There are some elegant words, introduced by physicians chiefly and philosophers, worthy to be retained; others, it may be, fitter to be abrogated, since there ought to be a law as well as a liberty in this particular. And in this choice there would be some regard had to the well-sounding and more harmonious words; and such as are numerous, and apt to fall gracefully into their cadences and periods, and so recommend themselves at the very first sight as it were; others, which (like false stones) will never shine in whatever light they be placed, but embase the rest. And here I note that such as have lived long in Universities do greatly affect words and expressions nowhere in use beside, as may be observed in Cleaveland's Poems for Cambridge; and there are also some Oxford words used by others, as I might instance in several.

"VIII. Previous to this it would be inquired what particular dialects, idioms, and proverbs were in use in every several county of England; for the words of the present age being properly the *vernacula*, or classic, rather special regard is to be had of them, and this consideration admits of infinite improvements.

"IX. And happily it were not amiss that we had a collection of the most quaint and courtly expressions, by way of *florilegium*, or phrases distinct from the proverbs, for we are infinitely defective as to civil addresses, excuses, and forms upon sudden and unpremeditated (though ordinary) encounters; in which the French, Italians, and Spaniards have a kind of natural grace and talent, which furnishes the conversation and renders it very agreeable; here may come in synonyms, homonyms, etc.

"X. And since there is likewise a manifest rotation and circling of words, which go in and out like the mode and fashion, books should be consulted for the reduction of some of the old laid-aside words and expressions had formerly *in deliciis*; for our language is in some places sterile and barren, by reason of this depopulation, as I may call it; and therefore such places should be new cultivated and enriched, either with the former (if significant) or some other. For example, we have hardly any words that do so fully express the French *cliquant*, *naïveté*, *ennui*, *bizarre*, *concert*, *façonier*, *chicaneries*, *consommé*, *emotion*, *defer*, *effort*, *chocq*, *entours*, *débouche*; or the Italian *vaghezza*, *garbato*, *svelto*. Let us, therefore (as the Romans did the Greek), make as many of these do homage as are like to prove good citizens.

"XI. Something might likewise be well translated out of the best orators and poets, Greek and Latin, and even out of the modern

languages, so that some judgment might be made concerning the elegance of the style, and a laudable and unaffected imitation of the best recommended to writers."

To the student of English, Evelyn's scheme for improving the language cannot fail to present points of marked interest and suggestiveness. He will recall the coincidence, that Mr. Jefferson, like Evelyn, advocated the study of the English county dialects, and will note with gratification the fact that, in our own day, the recommendations of both have assumed a definite shape in the formation of "Dialect Societies." Dr. Murray, editor of the great English Dictionary now in process of publication, has only of late repeated Evelyn's wish for more extensive and accurate collections of the technical terms in the language. The "reduction of old laid-aside words and expressions had formerly *in deliciis*," may be regarded as a characteristic of one of our modern philological schools. Furnivall, Oliphant, and Freeman have not labored without perceptible results.

It is but recently that an author of established fame has revived, in ordinary prose, the "*rath*" of our ancient usage (Sketches and Studies in Southern Europe, J. A. Symonds, Vol. II, p. 108). That the author of "English As She Is Spoke" should have, without design, "reduced" "*rather*" to its olden prerogative is a striking philological phenomenon. (See Appleton's Edition, p. 29.)

There are few writers of the XVII century who portray so faithfully the inner life of their era as Evelyn. To the student of history, as well as the student of philology, he is alike rich in suggestion and instruction.

H. E. SHEPHERD.

#### NOTE ON MERCATOR, v. 524.

Ovém tibi eccillám dabo, natam ánnos sexagínta,  
525 Pecúliarem. PAS. Meí senex, tam vétulam? LYS. Generis graécist.  
Eam seí curabeis, pérbonast : tondétur nimium scíte.

OVEM A, 'prisca exemplaria' Pii. *Quem* BCD; *tibi eccillam* Bothius. TIBIEÇILLAM, A; sed EC litteris incertis *tibi ecce illam*, CDFZ; *tibi ancillā*, B; permiro iudicio inde a Camerario propagatum, nec Grutero suspectum in Appul. t. III, p. 435 Oud.

Goetz gives the following conjectures: *tibi aniculam* (Buecheler); *tibi bellam* (*bellulam*) (Gertz, Schenkl); *tibi ad rem illam*



(Ussing); *tibi millam* (Bugge). To these Ribbeck has recently added another, *auratam* (Program of Leipzig Univ. 1882-3, p. 26). Both Buecheler and Ribbeck agree that *eccillam* is impossible, as the *ovis* is neither upon the stage to be pointed out, nor in the house which Pasicompsa is about to enter. Of course in *natam annos sexaginta* there is a covert allusion, which Pasicompsa does not understand, to Demipho, whom Lysimachus in v. 567 addresses as *vervex*. I propose to read *Apulam*. In v. 520 Pasicompsa has professed herself a good wool-spinner, and Lysimachus now promises to give her a sheep of the finest sort. The reputation of Apulian wool among the Romans is established by the following passages: Varro, L. L. IX 39 (Mueller, p. 208), *Sic enim lana Gallicana et Appula videtur imperito similis propter speciem, cum peritus Appulam emat pluris, quod in usu firmior sit*. Pliny, N. H. VIII 48, 73, *Lana autem laudatissima Apula et quae in Italia Graeci pecoris* (cf. Merc. 525, *Generis graecist*, which would apply also to Apulian sheep) *appellatur, alibi Italica; tertium locum Milesiae oves optinent*. Columella, VII 2, 3, *Generis eximii Calabras Apulasque et Milesias nostri existimabant, earumque optimas Tarentinas. Nunc Gallicae pretiosiores habentur*, etc. Martial, XIV 155:

Velleribus primis Appulia, Parma secundis  
Nobilis: Altinum tertia laudat ovis.

Plautus uses Apulia (with one *p*, A) in Casina, Prol. 72, and Apulus, Cas. Prol. 77 and Mil. 653, *Póst Ephesi sum ndlus, noenum in Ápulis, noenum Áminulae*. This passage shows that Apulia in Plautus' time was, to a certain extent, Hellenized, although its Greek was not of the purest (cf. Kiepert, Alte Geographie, p. 450). As for the palaeography, the change from *apulam* to *ancillam* is not so difficult as it may seem at first sight; cf. Men. 801,

Quándo te auratam ét vestitam béne habet, ancillás penum

*anpillaspen* B; *anpilla spen* CD; *ampulla spem* Z; *ampulosam* 'prisca exemplaria' Pii. Consequently by a reverse process it is easy to pass from *Apulam*, *Ápulam*, to *Anpillam* and then to *Ancillam*. In Nonius Marcellus (p. 480, l. 11, M) we actually find in the MSS *Ampolam* for *Apuliam*. It deserves to be noticed also that *ancilla* is of frequent occurrence in the Mercator, cf. vv. 201, 211, 261, 350, 390, 396, 414, 975, so that the emendation of *anpillam* to *ancillam* was very near at hand. In fact, in two other passages

the scribe of B has written *ancilla* where it does not belong, in v. 240, *ut una illec* (*illeg* D) *capra* CD; *ut una ancilla et una capra* B; v. 399, *Horunc illa* CD with A; *horum ancilla* B. Again, we may suppose that the scribe of B found in his exemplar *tibiā illā*, the *p* having fallen out. In this case, too, he would most likely have corrected to *tibi ancillā*. In any event *Apulam* seems to have at least as strong a claim to be the original reading as any of the emendations already proposed.

MINTON WARREN.

## V.—LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF.<sup>1</sup>

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pres.</i>
1 āgan (1089)	āh (1728) neg. form nāh (2253)	āhte (487)	
2 ge-belgan		gebulge (sub. pt.) (2332)	gebolgen (1540)
3 ā-belgan		ābealh (2281)	ābolgen (724)
4 beran (48)	byreð (2056)	bær (495) bæron (213)	boren (1193)
5 æt-beran (1562)		æt-bær (519) æt-bæron (28)	
6 for-beran (1878)			
7 ge-beran			geboren (1704)
8 ðð-beran		oðbær (579)	
9 on-beran (991)			onboren (2285)
10 berstan		būrston (819, 761)	
11 for-berstan		for-bærst (2681)	
12 beorgan (1294)		burgan (2600)	
13 be-beorgan (1747)			
14 ge-beorgan		ge-bearg (1549)	
15 ymb-beorgan		ymb-bearg (1504)	
16 beornan	(part. pres. byrnende, 2273)		
17 for-beornan		for-born (2673) for-barn (1617)	
18 ge-beornan		ge-barn (2698)	
19 béodan (385) } bíodan (2893) }		budon (1086)	boden (2958)
20 ā-béodan		ā-béad (390)	
21 be-béodan		be-béad (401)	
22 ge-béodan (3111)		ge-béad (2370)	

<sup>1</sup> The list embraces also the anomalous verbs, and a few of the more irregular weak verbs, which are marked in the list by a star (\*). The references are to the compiler's edition. The compounds have a special value as filling out the defective simples. It was thought sufficient to give one reference only for each form.

**LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN *BÉOWULF*. 463**

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
23 <i>béon</i>	<i>béo</i> (1826), <i>bið</i> (183) pl. <i>bíoð</i> (2064) <i>béoð</i> (1839) (see <i>wesan</i> ) imper. <i>béo</i> (1174)		
24 <i>biddan</i> (427)	<i>bidde</i> (1232)	<i>bæd</i> (29) <i>bædon</i> (176)	
25 <i>bindan</i>			<i>bunden</i> (1286)
26 <i>ge-bindan</i>		<i>ge-band</i> (420)	<i>ge-bunden</i> (872)
27 <i>on-bindan</i>		<i>on-band</i> (501)	
28 <i>bīdan</i> (2309)		<i>bād</i> (87) <i>bidon</i> (400)	
29 <i>ā-bīdan</i> (978)			
30 <i>ge-bīdan</i> (639)		<i>ge-bād</i> (7)	<i>gebiden</i> (1929)
31 <i>on-bīdan</i>		<i>on-bād</i> (2303)	
32 <i>bītan</i> (1455)		<i>bāt</i> (743)	
33 <i>blīcan</i> (222)			
34 <i>brecan</i> (2547)		<i>bræc</i> (1568)	<i>brocen</i> (2064)
35 <i>ge-brecan</i>		<i>ge-bræc</i> (2509)	
36 <i>tō-brecan</i> (781)			<i>tō-brocen</i> (998)
37 <i>purh-brecan</i>		<i>purh-bræc</i> (2793)	
38 <i>bregdan</i> (708)		<i>brægd</i> (795) <i>brugdon</i> (514) <i>ā-bræd</i> (2576)	<i>broden</i> <i>brogden</i> (1617)
39 <i>ā-bregdan</i>		<i>ge-brægd</i> (1565)	<i>ge-broden</i> (1444)
40 <i>ge-bregdan</i>		<i>ge-bræd</i> (1665) <i>on-bræd</i> (724) <i>ā-bréot</i> (2931)	
41 <i>on-bregdan</i>		<i>bréat</i> (1714)	
42 <i>ā-bréatan</i>		<i>ā-bréat</i> (1299)	<i>ā-broten</i> (1600)
43 <i>bréotan</i>		<i>brôhton</i> (1654)	
44 <i>ā-bréotan</i>			
45 * <i>bringan</i> (1863)	<i>bringe</i> (1830)		
46 <i>ge-bringan</i>	(pres. subj. pl.) <i>gebringan</i> (3010)		
47 <i>brūcan</i> (1046)	<i>brūceð</i> (1063)	<i>bréac</i> (1954)	
48 <i>būan</i> (2843)			
49 <i>ge-būan</i>	(pres. part. <i>būend</i> )		<i>gebūn</i> (117)
50 <i>būgan</i> (2919)	<i>būgeð</i> (2032)	<i>béah</i> (2957) <i>bugon</i> (327) <i>ā-béag</i> (776)	
51 <i>ā-būgan</i>			
52 <i>be-būgan</i>	<i>be-būgeð</i> (93)		

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Præ.</i>
53 ge-bûgan		ge-béah (1541) ge-béag (1242)	ge-bogen (2570)
54 *bycgan (1306)			
55 *be-bycgan		be-bohte (2800)	
56 *ge-bycgan		ge-bohte (974)	[ge-boh-]te(3015)
57 be-ceorfan		be-cearf (1592)	
58 céosan cíosan (2377) }		cure (subj. pret.) (2819)	
59 ge-céosan		ge-céas (2639)	gecoron(e) (206)
60 ge-cnâwan (2048)			
61 on-cnâwan		on-cníow (2555)	
62 cringan		cringon (1114) crunge (subj. pret.) (636)	
63 ge-cringan		ge-cranc (1210) ge-crang (1338) ge-crong (1569)	
64 cuman (244)	cymest (1383) cymeð (2059)	com (430) cwom (419) cwômon (239) cwôman (651) be-com (115) be-cwom (2366)	cumen (376)
65 be-cuman		ofer-cwom (1274)	ofercumen (846)
66 ofer-cuman		ofer-cômon (700)	
67 cunnan	(1) can (1181) (2) const (1378) (3) con (1740) cunnon (162)	cûðe (372) cûðon (119)	cûð (150) un-cûð (2215)
68 cweðan	cwið (2042)	cwæð (315) cwædon (3182)	
69 â-cweðan	â-cwyð (2047)	â-cwæð (655)	
70 ge-cweðan		(2) ge-cwæde (2665) (3) ge-cwæð (875) ge-cwædon (535)	
71 cwîðan (2113)			
72 déagan		déog (851)	
73 dôn (1117)	dêð (1059)	dyde (672) dydon (3165)	
74 ge-dôn (2187)	ge-dêð (1733)		

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 465*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
75 on-drædan (1675)		on-drêd (2348)	
76 drepan		dræp (2881)	drepen (1746) dropen (2982)
77 dréogan (1471)		dréah (2180) drugon (15)	
78 ā-dréogan (3079)			
79 ge-dréogan			gedrogen (2727)
80 ge-dréosan (2667)	ge-dréoseð (1755)		
81 drincan		dranc (743) druncon (1234)	druncen (539)
82 drīfan (1131)	drīfað (2809)		
83 tō-drīfan		tō-drāf (545)	
84 dugan	déah (369) duge (sub. pr., 590)	dohte (1345) dohtest (1822)	
85 durran	dearst (527) dear (685) dyrre (subj. pr., 1380)	dorste (1463) dorston (2849)	
86 ge-dūfan		ge-déaf (2701)	
87 purh-dūfan		purh-déaf (1620)	
88 etan (444)	eteð (448)		
89 purh-etan			purh-eton(e) (3050)
90 faran (124)		fōr (1405) fōron (1896)	
91 ge-faran (739)			
92 ūt-faran (2552)			
93 felgan		fealh (1282)	
94 æt-felgan		æt-fealh (969)	
95 feallan (1071)		féol (773) féoll (2976) féollon (1043)	
96 be-feallan			be-feallen (1127)
97 ge-feallan	ge-fealleð (1756)	ge-féoll (2101)	
98 ge-feohan } ge-féon }		ge-feah (109) ge-feh (2299) ge-fægon (1015) ge-fêgon (1628)	
99 ge-feohtan (1084)			
100 findan (207)		fand (720) fond (2137) (1) funde (1487) fundon (3054)	funden (7)

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pres.</i>
101 on-findan		on-fand (1892) on-funde (751)	on-funden (1294)
102 fléogan	fléogeð (2274)		
103 fléon (756)		fléah (2226)	
104 be-fléon (tô be-fléonne, 1004)			
105 ofer-fléon (2526)			
106 fléotan (542)		fléat (1910)	
107 flîtan		(2) flite (507)	
108 ofer-flîtan		ofer-flât (517)	
109 fôn (439)	fêhð (1756)	fêng (1543)	
110 be-fôn			be-fongen (977) be-fangen (1296)
111 ge-fôn		ge-fêng (741)	
112 on-fôn (912)		on-fêng (52)	
113 þurh-fôn (1505)			
114 wið-fôn		wið-fêng (761)	
115 ymbe-fôn		ymbe-fêng (2692)	
116 fretan (3015)		fræt (1582)	
117 frignan fringan (351) frinan	frin (imper., 1323)	frægn (236)	
118 ge-frignan ge-fringan ge-frinan		ge-frægn (194) ge-frægen (1012) ge-frunon (2) ge-frungon (667)	ge-frunen (2953) ge-frægen (1197)
119 galan (787)	gæleð (2461)		
120 â-galan		â-gôl (1522)	
121 gân (386) gangan (314) gongan (1643)	gæð (455) imper. { gân (1783) geong (2744)	géong (926) gíong (2410) gang (1010) *gengde (1413, 1402) *eode (358) eodon (493)	
122 â-gangan			â-gangen (1235)
123 full-gangan		full-eode (3120)	
124 ge-gân (1278) ge-gangan (2537)	ge-gangeð (1847)	ge-iode (2201) ge-eode (2677) ge-eodon (1968) ôð-eodon (2935) ofer-eode (1409) ofer-eodon (2960)	ge-gân (2631) ge-gongen (823)
125 ôð-gangan			
126 ofer-gangan			

LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN *BÉOWULF*. 467

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
127 ymb-gangan		ymb-eode (621)	
128 gifan } giofan (2973) }		geaf (1720) geâfon (49)	gyfen (64)
129 â-gifan (355)		â-geaf (2930)	
130 for-gyfan		for-geaf (17)	
131 of-gifan } of-gyfan (2589) }		of-geaf (2470) of-geâfon (1601) of-gêfan (2847)	
132 gildan } gyldan (11) }		geald (1048)	
133 an-gildan		an-geald (1252)	
134 â-gildan		â-geald (1665)	
135 for-gildan } for-gyldan (1055) }		for-geald (114)	
136 gilpan } gylpan (2007) }	gilpe gylpeð	gealp (2584)	
137 on-ginnan		on-gan (100) on-gon (2791) on-gunnon (245)	on-gunnen (409)
138 be-gitan		be-geat (1147) be-get (2873) be-geâton (2250)	
139 for-gitan	for-gyteð (1752)		
140 an-gitan } on-gitan (1912) } on-gytan (1497) }		an-geat (1292) on-geat (14) on-geâton (1432)	
141 glîdan		glâd (2074) glidan (515) tô-glâd (2488)	
142 tð-glîdan			
143 gréotan	gréoteð (1343)		
144 for-grindan		for-grand (424)	for-grunden (2336)
145 grîpan		grâp (1502)	
146 for-grîpan		for-grâp (2354)	
147 wið-grîpan (2522)			
148 grôwan		gréow (1719)	
149 *habban (446)	hæbbe (383) hafu (2525) hafast (1175) hafað (474) habbað (270) imper. hafa (659)	hæfde (79) hæfdon (538)	



<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Prt.</i>
150 *for-habban (1152)			
151 *wið-habban		wið-hæfde (773)	
152 hâtan (68)	hâte (293)	hêht (1036) hêt (198)	hâten (992)
153 ge-hâtan	ge-hâte (1393)	ge-hêt (2135) ge-hêton (175)	ge-hâten (2025)
154 hebban (657)			hafen (1291) hæfen (3024)
155 â-hebban			â-hæfen (1109) â-hafen (128) be-holen (414)
156 be-helan			
157 helpan (2341)		healp (2699)	
158 healdan (230)	healdest (1706) healdeð (2910)	híold (1955) héold (2378) héoldon (2720) be-héold (494)	
159 be-healdan			
160 for-healdan			for-healden (2382)
161 ge-healdan (2857)	ge-healdeð (2294)	ge-héold (2621)	
162 ge-héawan	ge-héawe (subj. pres., 683)		
163 héofan	híofende (pres. part., 3143)		
164 hladan (2127)			hladen (3135) (gilp)-hlæden (869)
165 ge-hladan		ge-hlôd (896)	
166 â-hlehhan		â-hlôg (731)	
167 hléapan (865)			
168 â-hléapan		â-hléop (1398)	
169 hléotan		hléat (2386)	
170 tð-hlîdan			tð-hliden(e) (1000)
171 hnîtan		hniton (1328)	
172 be-hôn			be-hongen (3140)
173 hréoðan			hroden (495)
174 ge-hréoðan			ge-hroden (304)
175 hréosan		hréas (2489) hruron (1075)	
176 be-hréosan			be-hroren(e) (2763)

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 469*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pres.</i>
177 hrīnan (989)		hrān (2271)	
178 hweorfan (2889) } hworfan (1729) }		hwearf (55) hwurfe (subj. pt., 264)	
179 and-hweorfan		and-hwearf (548)	
180 æt-hweorfan		æt-hwearf (2300)	
181 ge-hweorfan		ge-hwearf (1211)	
182 geond-hweorfan		geond-hwearf (2018)	
183 hwōpan		hwéop (2269)	
184 *hycgan		hogode (633)	
185 be-irnan (rinnan)		be-arn (67)	
186 on-irnan		on-arn (722)	
187 lâcan (2849)			
188 for-lâcan			for-lâcen (904)
189 lætan	læteð (1729)	lêt (2390) lêton (48)	
190 â-lætan (2592)			
191 for-lætan (793)		for-lêt (971) for-lêton (3168)	
192 of-lætan	of-lætest (1184)	of-lêt (1623)	
193 on-lætan	on-læteð (1610)		
194 *â-lecgan		â-legde (835) â-lêdon (34) â-legdon (3142)	
195 leahan } léan }	lyhð (1049)	lôg (1812) lôgon (203)	
196 be-léan (511)			
197 léogan		léah (3030)	
198 â-léogan		â-lêh (80)	
199 ge-léogan		ge-léah (2324)	
200 be-léosan			be-loren (1074)
201 for-léosan		for-léas (1471)	for-loren (2146)
202 *libban	lifað (3169) lyfað (945) leofað (975) ligeð (1344)	lifde (57) lyfde (2145) lifdon (99) læg (40) lâgon (3049) lægon (566) â-læg (1529) ge-læg (3147)	
203 licgan (3130) } licgean (967) }			
204 â-licgan (2887)			
205 ge-licgan			

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Prt.</i>
206 limpan		lomp (1988)	
207 â-limpan		â-lamp (623)	â-lumpen (734)
208 be-limpan		be-lamp (2469)	
209 ge-limpan	ge-limpeð (1754)	ge-lomp (76) ge-lamp (1253)	ge-lumpen (825)
210 linnan (1479)			
211 liðan			liden (223)
212 lihan		lâh (1457)	
213 on-lihan		on-lâh (1468)	
214 lûcan			locen(e) (1506)
215 be-lûcan		be-léac (1133)	
216 ge-lûcan			ge-locen (2770)
217 on-lûcan		on-léac (259)	
218 tû-lûcan (782)			
219 magan	(1) mæg (277) (2) meaht (2048) mæge(2531) } subj. pr. mægen(2654)	meahte (542) mihte (190) mehte (1083) meahton (649) mihton (308) mealt (2327) multon (1121) ge-mealt (898) mæton (918) ge-mæt (925)	
220 meltan (3012)		mîste (168) mîston (1629)	
221 ge-meltan			
222 metan			
223 ge-metan			
224 môtan	(1),(3) môt (186, 604) (2) mîst (1672) mîton (347) mîte (1388, pres. subj.)		
225 ge-munan	ge-man (265) ge-mon (2428)	ge-munde (759) ge-mundon (179) on-munde (2641) mearn (136) murne (subj. pt., 1386) be-mearn (908)	
226 on-munan			
227 murnan			
228 be-murnan } be-meornan }			
229 ge-nesan		ge-næs (1000)	ge-nesen (2398)
230 néotan	néot (imper., 1218)		
231 be-néotan (681)		bi-néat (2397)	
232 niman	nimeð (441) nymeð (1847)	nom (1613) nam (747) nâman (2117)	numen (1154)

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 471*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
233 be-niman		be-nam (1887)	
234 for-niman		for-nam (557)	
		for-nâmon (2829)	
235 ge-niman		ge-nam (1873)	ge-numen (3167)
		ge-nom (2777)	
236 nîpan	pres. part. nîpende (547)		
237 rædan (2057)			
238 be-réofan			berofen(e) (2392)
239 réotan	réotað (1377)		
240 rîdan (234)		râd (1884)	
		rîodan (3171)	
241 ge-rîdan		ge-râd (2899)	
242 â-rîsan		â-râs (399)	
243 rôwan		réon (réowon) (512)	
244 sacan (439)			
245 ge-sacan (1005)			
246 on-sacan (2955)	on-sæce (subj.pr., 1943)		
247 scacan (1804) } sceacan	sceaceð (2743)	scôc (2255)	scacen (1125) sceacen (2307)
248 ge-scâdan		ge-scêd (1556)	
249 scânan		scíonon (303)	
250 sceran	scireð (1288)		
251 ge-sceran		ge-scær (1527)	
		ge-scer (2974)	
252 sceaðan		scôd (1888)	
253 ge-sceaðan		ge-scôd (1588)	
		ge-scéod (2224)	
254 sceopan } sceppan } scyppan }		scôp (78)	scepen (2915)
255 ge-sceopan		ge-sceôp (97)	
256 scéotan	scéoteð (1745)		
257 ge-scéotan		ge-scéat (2320)	
258 of-scéotan		of-scêt (2440)	
259 scînan (1518)	scîneð (607)	scân (321)	
		scinon (995)	
		scionon (303)	
260 scriðan (651)	scriðað (163)		
261 scrîfan (980)			
262 for-scrîfan			for-scrifen (106)

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Prt.</i>
263 ge-scrīfan		ge-scrâf (2575)	
264 sculan	sceall (2499)	scolde (10)	
	(1, 3) sceal (20, 251)	sceolde (2342)	
	scel (455)	sceoldest (2342)	
	(2) scealt (589)	soldon (41)	
	sculon (684)		
	scile (3178) } (subj.)		
	scyle (2658) }		
265 scûfan		scufon (215)	scofen (919)
		scufun (3132)	
266 be-scûfan (184)			
267 *secgan (273)	secge (1998)	sægde (1810)	(ge)-sægd (141)
	secgað (411)	sægdest (532)	(ge)-sæd (1697)
		sægdon (377)	
		sædan (1946)	
268 *sellan } syllan (2161) }	seleð (1731)	sealde (72)	
		sealdest (1483)	
		sealdon (1162)	
269 *sêcan {665} } sêcean (200) }	sêceð (2273)	sôhte (2301)	(ge)-soht(e)
	sêceað (3002)	sôhtest (458)	(1840)
	imper. sêc (1380)	sôhton (339)	
		sohtan (2381)	
270 séoðan		séað (1994)	
271 séon (921)		seah (2015)	
		sægon (1423)	
272 ge-séon (396)	ge-syhð (2042)	ge-seah (247)	
		ge-sâwon (1606)	
		ge-sêgan (3039)	
		ge-sêgon (3129)	
273 geond-séon		geond-seh (3088)	
274 ofer-séon		ofer-sâwon (419)	
275 on-séon		on-sâwon (1651)	
276 singan		song (323)	
		sang (496)	
277 â-singan			â-sungen (1160)
278 sittan (493)	siteð (2907)	sæt (500)	
	imper. site (489)	sæton (1165)	
		sêtan (1603)	
279 be-sittan		be-sæt (2937)	
280 for-sittan	for-siteð (1768)		
281 ge-sittan		ge-sæt (171)	ge-seten (2105)
282 of-sittan		of-sæt (1546)	

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 473*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
283 ofer-sittan (685)	ofer-sitte (2529)		
284 on-sittan (598)			
285 ymb-sittan		ymb-sæton (564)	
286 sîgan		sigon (307)	
287 ge-sîgan (2660)			
288 slæpan	slæpend(e) (pr. part., 2220)		
289 sleahan } sleân }		slôh (1566) slôg (108) slôgon (2051)	slægen (1153)
290 ge-sléan		ge-slôh (459) ge-slôgan (2997)	
291 of-sléan		of-slôh (574)	
292 slîtan		slât (742)	
293 on-spannan		on-spéon (2724)	
294 spîwan (2313)			
295 spôwan		spéow (2855)	
296 sprecan (2070)		spræc (1169) spræce (531) spræcon (1477)	sprecen (644)
297 ge-sprecan		ge-spræc (676)	
298 springan		sprang (18) sprong (1589) sprungon (2583)	
299 ge-springan		ge-sprang (1668) ge-sprong (885) on-sprungon (818)	
300 on-springan			
301 standan (2272) }	standeð (1363)	stôd (927)	
302 stondan (2761) }	(pl.) standað (2867)	stôdon (328) stôdan (3048)	
303 â-standan		â-stôd (760)	
304 æt-standan		æt-stôd (892)	
305 for-standan (2956)		for-stôd (1550)	
306 ge-standan		ge-stôd (358) ge-stôdon (2597)	
307 stapan		stôp (762)	
308 æt-stapan		æt-stôp (746)	
309 ge-stapan		ge-stôp (2290)	
310 stincan		stonc (2289)	
311 stîgan		[st]âg (2363) stigon (212)	

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
312 â-stîgan	â-stîgeð (1374)	â-stâh (1119) â-stâg (783)	
313 ge-stîgan		ge-stâh (633)	
314 strûdan		strude (subj. pret., 3127)	
315 for-swâfan		for-swéof (2815)	
316 for-swâpan		for-swéop (477)	
317 *swebban (680)	swefeð (601)		
318 *â-swebban			â-swefede (567)
319 swefan (119)	swefeð (1742) swefað (2257)	swæf (1801) swæfon (704) swæfun (1281)	
320 swelgan		swealh (744) swulge (sub. pret., 783)	
321 for-swelgan		for-swealg (1123)	
322 swellan (2714)			
323 sweltan		swealt (1618)	
324 swerian		swôr (2739)	
325 for-swerian			for-sworen (805)
326 sweorcan	sweorceð (1738)		
327 for-sweorcan	for-sworceð (1768)		
328 ge-sweorcan		ge-swearc (1790)	
329 swymman (1625)			
330 ofer-swimman		ofer-swam (2368)	
331 swincan		swuncon (517)	
332 swingan	swingeð (2265)		
333 swîcan		swâc (1461)	
334 ge-swîcan		ge-swâc (2585)	
335 on-swîfan		on-swâf (2560)	
336 swôgan	(pres. part., 3146) swôgende		
337 *syrwan		syrede (161)	
338 *ge-tæcan		ge-tæhte (313)	
339 *tellan		tealde (795) tealdon (2185)	
340 téon (1037)		téah (553)	togen (1289)
341 â-téon		â-téah (767)	
342 ge-téon	imper. ge-téoh (366)	ge-téah (2611)	
343 of-téon		of-téab (5)	

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 475*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
344 þurh-téon (1141)			
345 tredan (1965)		træd (1644)	
346 *þencan	þenceð (289)	þôhte (692)	
		þôhton (541)	
347 þéon		þâh (8)	
(for þîhan)			
348 ge-þéon (25)			
349 on-þéon		on-þâh (901)	
350 þicgan (1011) }		þêgon (563)	
þicgean (737) }		þêgun (2634)	
351 ge-þicgan		ge-þeah (619)	
		ge-þah (1025)	
		ge-þægon (1015)	
352 ge-þingan			ge-þungen (625)
353 þringan		þrong (2884)	
		þrungon (2961)	
354 for-þringan (1085)			
355 ge-þringan		ge-þrang (1913)	
356 þurfan	(2) þearft (450)	þorfte (157)	
	þearf (596)	þorfton (2365)	
	þurfe (subj. pres., 2496)		
357 ge-þweran			ge-þuren (for ge-þworen (1286)
358 *þyncan }	þinceð (1749)	þûhte (2462)	
þincean (1342) }	þynceð (2654)	þûhton (867)	
	þinceað (368)		
359 unnan	an (1226)	ûðe (961)	
360 ge-unnan (346)		ge-ûðe (1662)	
361 wacan		wôc (1266)	
		wôcun (60)	
362 on-wacan		on-wôc (2288)	
		on-wôcon (111)	
363 wadan		wôd (2662)	
364 ge-wadan			ge-waden (220)
365 on-wadan		on-wôd (?) (916)	
366 þurh-wadan		þurh-wôd (891)	
367 wegan (3016)		wæg (1208)	
368 æt-wegan		æt-wæg (1199)	
369 ge-wegan (2401)			



<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
370 <i>wesan</i> (272) (see <i>béon</i> )	<i>eom</i> (335) <i>eart</i> (352) <i>is</i> (256) <i>ys</i> (2911) (1) <i>synt</i> (260) (2) <i>syndon</i> (237) (3) <i>sint</i> (388) subj. pres. <i>sie</i> (435) <i>sý</i> (1832) <i>sig</i> (1779) pres. part. <i>wesende</i> (46) imper. <i>wes</i> (269)	<i>wæs</i> (11) <i>wære</i> (1479) <i>wæron</i> (233) <i>wæran</i> (2476)	
371 <i>wēpan</i>		[ <i>wéop</i> ] (3152 ?)	
372 <i>wealdan</i> (442)	<i>wealde</i> (1860)	<i>wéold</i> (465) <i>wéoldon</i> (2052)	
373 <i>ge-wealdan</i> (1510)		<i>ge-wéold</i> (1555)	<i>ge-wealden(e)</i> (1733)
374 <i>weallan</i>	pl. <i>weallaþ</i> (2066)	<i>wéol</i> (515) <i>wéoll</i> (2139)	
375 <i>weaxan</i> (3116)	<i>weaxeþ</i> (1742)	<i>weoþ</i> (8) <i>ge-weoþ</i> (66) <i>weaþ</i> (6) <i>wurdon</i> (228) <i>wurde</i> (subj. pret., 2732)	
1997)		<i>ge-weaþ</i> (3062)	<i>ge-worden</i> (1305)
2)		<i>weaþ</i> (1532) <i>for-wurpe</i> (subj. pret., 2873) <i>ofer-weaþ</i> (1544)	
		<i>wolde</i> (68) <i>woldon</i> (482)	
	(1) <i>wille</i> (344) <i>wylle</i> (948) (2) <i>wylt</i> (1855) (3) <i>wile</i> (346) <i>wyle</i> (2865) <i>wile</i> (442) <i>wylle</i> (2770) pl. <i>wyllaþ</i> (1819)	neg. forms: <i>welle</i> (680) <i>wolde</i> (792)	
		<i>wand</i> (1130) <i>wundre</i> (212)	<i>wunden</i> (1194)

*LIST OF IRREGULAR (STRONG) VERBS IN BÉOWULF. 477*

<i>Infinitive.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Preterite.</i>	<i>Part. Pret.</i>
384 æt-windan		æt-wand (143)	
385 be-windan		be-wand (1462)	be-wunden(1032)
386 ge-windan (764)		ge-wand (1002)	
387 on-windan	on-windeð (1611)		
388 winnan		wan (144)	
		won (1133)	
		wunne (506)	
		wunnon (113)	
389 witan (252)	wât (1332)	wiste (822)	
	wâst (272)	wisse (2340)	
	neg. form : nât (274)	wiston (799)	
		wisson (246)	
390 ge-witan (1351)			
391 ge-wîcan		ge-wâc (2578)	
392 wîgan (2510)	wîgeð (600)		
393 wîtan (2742)			
394 æt-wîtan		æt-witon (1151)	
395 ge-wîtan (42)	ge-wîteð (1361)	ge-wât (123)	ge-witen (1480)
		ge-witon (854)	
396 ðð-wîtan (2996) *			
397 wlîtan		wlât (1573)	
		wliton (1593)	
		wlitan (2853)	
398 geond-wlîtan	}		
giond-wlîtan(2772)			
399 wrecan (874)		wræc (2707)	wrecen (2963)
400 â-wrecan		â-wræc (1725)	
401 for-wrecan (1920)		for-wræc (109)	
402 ge-wrecan		ge-wræc (107)	ge-wrecen (3063)
		ge-wræcan (2480)	
403 wrîðan (965)		wriðon (2983)	ge-wriðen(e)
			(1938)
404 writan			writen (1689)
405 for-writan		for-wrât (2706)	
406 *wyrcan (931)		worhte (1453)	(ge-)worht(e)
			(1865)

J. A. HARRISON.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

**A History of English Rhythms.** By EDWIN GUEST, LL. D., D. C. L., F. R. S.  
A new edition, edited by the REV. WALTER W. SKEAT, M. A. London,  
George Bell & Sons, 1882.

The late Dr. Guest's *History of English Rhythms* was first published in 1838, and was a pioneer in a new field. It is not much to the credit of English scholars that but little was done for the further elucidation of this subject until the publication of Professor Schipper's work on *Old English Metre*, early in 1882. Professor Skeat seems to have prepared this new edition of Dr. Guest's work before the publication of Prof. Schipper's, as he nowhere makes allusion to it, although the respective prefaces are dated Sept., 1881, and July, 1882.<sup>1</sup> Schipper's work has already been noticed in this *Journal* (Vol. III, No. 11, p. 355), and it now remains to give a brief account of Dr. Guest's work, as the first edition has been long out of print, and a new generation of scholars has grown up, many of them born since its publication. Schipper (p. 2) makes the following criticism of this work: "Dr. Guest macht die älteste Form englischer Poesie, nämlich die alliterierende Langzeile, oder vielmehr die rhythmische Section derselben, wie er sich ausdrückt, zur Basis auch der späteren unter ganz anderen Einflüssen sich entwickelnden englischen Verskunst und zieht aus dieser Voraussetzung dann natürlich ganz falsche Schlüsse. Eine weitere Folge davon ist, dass es so verworren angelegt und durchgeführt ist, dass man sich nur mit grosser Mühe, selbst wenn man von seinem Gedankengange sich leiten lässt, hindurchfinden kann, und so ist denn das Werk, trotz der grossen Fülle von Material, die es bietet, als *gänzlich veraltet und unbrauchbar* zu bezeichnen," and he refers, in confirmation of this criticism, to Prof. Mayor's article in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1873-74. Prof. Skeat has remedied some of the defects of form chargeable to the first edition, in that he has incorporated in the text the notes of that edition, has added notes of his own explaining or correcting statements in the text, has revised the quotations and supplied exact references, and has added an index of authors and a table of rhythms, so that the work is not so unserviceable as formerly. The quotations, however, so far from being "well arranged," as Mr. Skeat says, should have been arranged *historically*, so that we should not find a quotation from Chaucer immediately following one from Burns. Moreover, I do not think that most persons will agree with Mr. Skeat in his preference for the author's method of marking accentuation, namely, with a bar [ | ] after the accented syllable, so liable to be confounded with metrical division (as Mr. Swifte did confound it),—but this is a small matter.

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Skeat mentions Schipper's work in his *Introduction to Specimens of Early English*, Part I, p. xxxvi, which was published before July, 1882, hence the lack of reference to it in his preface to Dr. Guest's work is the more noticeable.

Instead of simply referring to Ellis and Sweet, Mr. Skeat might have corrected some of Dr. Guest's statements with respect to the values of the English letters; for, however excusable these statements might have been in 1838, they were not so excusable in 1882. It may suffice to refer to the remarks about *y*, and especially to the remark (p. 8 *ad init.*): "but if the *y* of *your* be a consonant, so must also be the *e* of *Europe*," and to the so-called diphthongs "formed by prefixing *y* to the eleven vowels" (p. 11); one might as well speak of the Latin vowel *j* in *jam* or the German vowel *j* in *ja*: Mr. Skeat's note is not helpful on this point. See also the remarks on *w* and *wh* (pp. 9, 10); and as to Mr. Skeat's correction of Dr. Guest's pronunciation of *a* in *Mary* as *a* in *ate*, I would say that this is the almost universal pronunciation in this country, and not as *ai* in *hair*, with Mr. Skeat; again, with respect to the diphthongal character claimed for this sound of *a*, is not that caused by the following *r* in *hair* or *hare*, and when not followed by *r*, is it not a simple vowel as in *glad* (A. S. *glæd*)? See here Sweet's A. S. Reader (p. xvii), where *there* and *hair* are given as key-words for the *long* sound of this vowel [æ] and *man* for the *short* sound. One other letter unnoticed by Mr. Skeat may be mentioned: on p. 65 Dr. Guest speaks of "the *dental* letters *f* and *th*,"—no misprint, as the examples show.

The work is divided into four books, of from seven to ten chapters each. Book I treats of rhythm, the voice, *i. e.* letters and sounds, syllables, accent, quantity, rime, and pauses, so that it is introductory to the whole subject. One great merit of the work consists in the numerous examples given in illustration of each statement, but in the case of our older writers, as Chaucer, for example, better editions have been published of late years, so that the text often needs correction. So too, thanks to Prof. Child, we now know much more about Chaucer's grammar than Dr. Guest knew fifty years ago, and therefore much of what he says about the final *e* is antiquated, but he deserves credit for having rightly appreciated its importance to a correct understanding of Chaucer's verse. On this subject (p. 30) Prof. Skeat refers to "note in the appendix," but unfortunately there is no note there. (It would have been a convenience if a reference had always been given on the page where each note applies.) In his note to p. 31 Mr. Skeat has settled the question as to "Saint Eloy," if it required a re-settlement, notwithstanding Mr. Furnivall's theory. We might allow even the "dainty" prioress so mild an oath. Dr. Guest is careful to notice all cases of elision of vowels in connection with each letter, but Mr. Skeat says: "the very strict views upon the subject of elision which were laid down in the first volume seem to have been considerably relaxed in other passages of the work" (p. vii). The subject of *accent* is too wide to enter upon in a brief review; suffice it to say that Dr. Guest believed it to be "the *sole* principle" that regulates our English rhythms (p. 108), and that we have no metrical quantity in the English language. He thus at once cast aside notions derived from the classical rhythms, and established "the *sole* principle" of English metre, differing from many previous writers on versification, but deserving the thanks of all English scholars. The observed prevalence of this principle doubtless led him to his later more elastic views with respect to elision, for holding strict views on this point is but an illustration of the attempt to reduce English versification to classical rules, and to restrict the freedom of move-

ment of our earlier rhythms. The classical tradition, however, is seen in his refusal to allow more than *one* unaccented syllable, or at most *two* such syllables, between each accented syllable, which causes a total misconception of Anglo-Saxon rhythm, as is seen in the next book.

Book II treats in full Dr. Guest's elaborate system of English rhythms, and after a careful perusal of it, the justness of Schipper's criticism is seen to be fully substantiated. Prof. Skeat's table is here of great assistance in following Dr. Guest's arrangement of his quotations. It would extend this notice to unreasonable length to go into a minute examination of the different classes of rhythms. There are thirty-six varieties, according to the number and position of the accented and unaccented syllables, but section I (A b A), for example, "is intended to include similar metres of *more* than three syllables, such as A b A b A," and so on *ad infinitum*, and the change of the pause, or caesura, is considered to change the character of the rhythm, so that the examples given by Mr. Skeat from L'Allegro (p. xviii), by way of illustration, are arranged as follows:

"Haste | thee nymph | : and bring | with thee | " (the bar denoting the accent), is A b A : b A b A, or 1 : 5, while "And | the milk | maid : sing | eth blithe | " is A b A b : A b A, or 1 / : 1, / denoting the unaccented syllable added to 1 (A b A). The colon [:] denotes the caesural pause between the sections, which Schipper (pp. 258-9) excludes from rhythm of this kind originally, though he concedes that it entered later. He thinks that Dr. Guest's assumption of it in the earlier rhythms of four feet, as in the Owl and Nightingale, has caused him to mingle verses of different origin, which view seems justified by the examples. But the possibilities of the system may be shown in Dr. Guest's own words. He says (p. 160): "Our verses of two and three accents consist merely of the simple sections; but the verse of four accents is the representative of the short alliterative couplet, containing two sections, each of two accents. The number then of all the possible varieties is the product of eighteen multiplied into itself, or 324. In like manner the verse of six accents is composed of two sections, each containing three; and the number of possible varieties is the product of thirty-six multiplied by itself, or 1296. The possible varieties of the verse with five accents is also 1296: to wit, 648 when the first section has two accents, and the like number when it has three." He well adds: "Of this vast number, by far the larger portion has never yet been applied to the purposes of verse." (!) When one has once conceived a mechanically regular system of such prodigious scope, it would be strange indeed if, in the most regular poems, lines showing metrical license could not here and there be found which might be brought under one or other of the above-mentioned forms, so that in chapter III, on verses of four accents, lines from L'Allegro and Il Penseroso are quoted under no less than *eight* different sectional groups, and the line "The cherub Con : templatation" (p. 185) is treated as false rhythm, because the caesura is disregarded, or misplaced. The metre of these two poems, however, is not derived from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, as Dr. Guest would have us believe; but it is the riming couplet of four feet (treated by Schipper in section III, chapter 14), the verses beginning with either an accented or an unaccented syllable. In this chapter alone Dr. Guest rightly treats Anglo-Saxon rhythms, as he finds many examples of verses showing the four accents, separated by one or two unac-

cented syllables, but in the following chapters on verses of five accents, arranged according as the section of two accents precedes or follows that of three accents, his treatment of Anglo-Saxon verse is erroneous. In chapter I (p. 159) of this book he takes exception to Rask's view of the "complement," and lays down his own rules, but Rask's view was more nearly right. Prof. Skeat does not anywhere lead us to suppose that he differs from Dr. Guest, though it is scarcely possible that he should hold these antiquated views with respect to Anglo-Saxon verse. The following examples will show Dr. Guest's accentuation:

sec | ga swat | e : sith | than sun | ne up | (p. 210);  
 gif | um grow | ende | : on god | es ric | e (p. 232);  
 ne | waes her | tha giet | : nym | the heol | ster-scead | o (p. 249);  
 wes | an an | e win | ter-stun | de : thon | ne ic mid | this wer | ode (p. 268)<sup>1</sup>

On this system the regular Anglo-Saxon alliterative verse may have four, five, six, and even seven accents, and the long lines of the pseudo-Caedmon eight and nine accents (pp. 275-6). The examples of Anglo-Saxon verse are taken chiefly from Genesis and Exodus, and from the so-called Metres of Aelfred,<sup>2</sup> whose very defective rhythm will not serve as a basis for any sound conclusions. Many examples from Chaucer and Shakspeare have been corrected by Professor Skeat, and so have vitiated the conclusions of Dr. Guest drawn from them; but the accentuation of others might have been corrected; *e. g.*,

Vive | le roi | : as | I have bank'd | their towns | K. J. 5. 7, 104 (p. 209);  
 read "Vi | ve" and "as I |,"  
 Of | the bod | ies: and | the gret | e honour | , Knights Tale, C. T. 993  
 (p. 211);  
 read Of the | bodi | es: and | the grete | honour | ;  
 In | his fight | inge: wer | e a wood | leon | , 1665;  
 read In his | fighting | e: were | a wood | leon | ;

I use the bar to mark the accent, not the metrical division into feet, for the sake of comparison, though the two coincide in the examples from Chaucer.

Prof. Skeat has been too sparing in his corrections of false accents, although the corrections made are almost invariably right. Dr. Guest's views have led him wrong also in respect to the metre of Layamon, and Prof. Skeat has followed him; but this metre is developed from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, as Schipper has shown (section III, chapter 7), though under Norman-French influence, and it is therefore much freer in its movement.<sup>3</sup> So in respect to the metre of Piers Plowman, which poem Prof. Skeat has made his own, it also is derived from the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, and has been discussed by Schipper (section III, chapter 10). I have no space for examples of this mistaken accentuation, but some may be found on p. 254 *ad fin.* Prof. Skeat has rightly corrected Dr. Guest's note on *eyr* (p. 176), and for examples of

<sup>1</sup> The quantity of the Anglo-Saxon vowels is not marked in the work.

<sup>2</sup>A. Leicht, in *Anglia* VI 126, discusses the question of the authorship of the alliterating metres of Boethius, and comes to the conclusion that the metres were not written by King Alfred, thus agreeing with Wright, as against Hartmann, who, in *Anglia* V 411, had come to a different conclusion.

<sup>3</sup> Compare on the metre of Layamon the articles of Wissmann, Einenkel, Schipper, and Trautmann in *Anglia* V.

subject to Schipper, section III, chapters 5 and 13, and for its origin to chapter I also. The expression "tumbling verse" is derived from King James's "Reulis and Cautelis," and is most unfortunate to designate the anapaestic rhythms, or mixed iambic and anapaestic, of which a very indifferent example is given from Lydgate's "London Lickpenny," and another from Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar, February, of which Dr. Guest says (p. 536): "The distinction between this metre and that of Christabel is slight indeed," but Coleridge claims that his metre is "founded on a *new principle*, namely, that of counting in each line the accents, not the syllables."<sup>1</sup> The principle is certainly old enough, being the basis of all Anglo-Saxon rhythms, but having been so long neglected, Coleridge might claim credit for its revival.

Other matters worthy of consideration must be passed over, in order to notice briefly book IV, which treats of poems written in staves, or stanzas, although the two are thus defined by Dr. Guest (p. 562): "A stave is a portion of a song or poem, containing a given number of verses, arranged according to some given law, and ending with a period, or at least with some important division of a sentence. When two or more staves are knit together into one, the compound stave thence resulting may be called a stanza—a name that seems to have been first applied to the compound Italian staves, which came into fashion during the sixteenth century." The ordinary *common*, *long* or *short* metre stanza, then, is simply a stave, while the sonnet is a stanza proper. Popular usage, however, does not recognize the distinction. The stave forms are treated by Schipper in section IV, chapters 1-7 on *strophes*. Dr. Guest thinks (p. 564) that during the eleventh and early twelfth century our versification was gradually taking a form similar to the Icelandic, and if it "had continued free from foreign influences but one century longer, it might have exhibited the same peculiarities of structure which were afterwards adopted by the Icelandic." We should be thankful, then, to the "foreign influences" on this account, as on many others. This book treats the origin of the staves from Latin and Romance rhythms, and their various forms, those with continuous and interwoven rime, the psalm staves, those with the burthen, wheel, and bob-wheel, or "short and abrupt wheel, which came into fashion during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries" (p. 621), and (whether of Latin or Celtic origin, Dr. Guest does not stop to inquire) was "familiar to the Romance dialects before it was adopted by the English," the earliest native specimen being found in a Hymn to the Virgin of about the year 1200. The "ballet-stave" in its various forms is next discussed,—the most common being the Chaucer stanza of seven lines, or "rhythme-royal," as Gascoigne called it,—the *roundle* and the *virelay*, though Dr. Guest does not "profess to give every variety of ballet-stave that may be found in our poetry, for the number would rather confuse the reader than enlighten him" (p. 650); and finally, the sonnet, which is, however, all too briefly treated. While of Sicilian origin, it owes its celebrity to Petrarch, but its structure was changed by the Italians of the sixteenth century; it was introduced into English verse by Surrey [and Wyatt], and used by Spenser, Shakspeare and Milton, by whose aid it recovered its original form. The final couplet was soon lost, and the

<sup>1</sup> For some judicious remarks on the metre of Christabel compare Leigh Hunt's essay on "What is Poetry?" prefixed to his Selections from the English Poets.



sonnet gave birth to the elegiac stave, which, with the ballad stave, thinks Dr. Guest, was the last invented (p. 656).

The following chapter treats the "broken staves," of which Waller's familiar song, "Go, lovely rose," is an example of a stave of five verses broken in the first and third, and Bryant's [not Briant's] "Address to a Waterfowl," is an example of another variety. It may be remarked, in passing, that this is the sole quotation I find from any American poet. The Spenser staves are next discussed, under which title are included not only the Spenserian stanza of nine verses, but all those in which an Alexandrine is added to some well-known combination, or substituted for the last verse of the stanza (p. 667). Dr. Guest remarks with reference to the Spenser stave used by Chatterton that "this anachronism would, of itself, be sufficient to prove the forgery, even though it had baffled every other test which modern criticism has applied to it" (p. 672), and Mr. Skeat adds a quotation to the same effect from his *Essay on the Rowley Poems*. The last chapter contains a brief historical sketch of our early poets and their works, from the fifth century to the fourteenth inclusive, but whatever the date of the Gleeman's Song, which must be interpolated, modern criticism will hardly assign "Beowulf" to the fifth century, although "they are the most venerable relics of our early literature" (p. 675).

Whatever exceptions may be taken to Dr. Guest's statements, or to his classification of English rhythms, it is well to have his valuable work accessible in convenient form, although much of it is now antiquated, and it should have been accompanied by a commentary stating the more modern views on various points. This publication makes all the more necessary a speedy translation into English of Schipper's work, for it is to be hoped that English scholars will not take Dr. Guest's work as an unquestioned authority, when one written from the standpoint of modern criticism, in a strictly historical and much more systematic manner, is readily accessible. The subject is one of great interest, and one which has been sadly neglected, so that it has been thought advisable to republish this work, which dates back a half-century, and was the sole authority for its day. A handbook for instruction in the history and classification of English rhythms is much needed, but it will be written on the basis of Prof. Schipper's work rather than of Dr. Guest's. The two invite comparison and there can be no question as to the preference. It is only to be hoped that Schipper's work may be soon completed, so that the subject may be brought down to the present day.

Prof. Skeat adds to the volume a list of Dr. Guest's papers on philological subjects, which are buried in the *Proceedings of the Philological Society of London*. Now that the collection of his archaeological papers has been published in "*Origines Celticae*,"—an insufficient title,—it would be a useful work to have his philological papers also republished, for they treat subjects important to every English scholar, and idioms on which I do not doubt that one of his clear perception and extensive learning has thrown much light. Dr. Guest highly appreciated the study of his own language, and his remarks on the neglect of it, while not so applicable now as in 1838, are still too true: "The little attention that is paid to the critical study of our language, and the slight regard which attempts to investigate its history have met with, reflect no less discredit on our patriotism than on our scholarship" (pp. 702-3). The Early



English Text Society has done much to relieve English scholars of this discredit, but the results of its labors still need to be systematized and put in more popular and accessible form. After commenting on the range of influence of the English language even in 1838—and how much greater now!—Dr. Guest well concludes: "Though it were not our mother-tongue, it would still, of all living languages [or dead, I would add], be the one most worthy of our study and our cultivation, as bearing most directly on the happiness of mankind."

JAMES M. GARNETT.

---

Sammlung Romanischer Grammatiken. Raetoromanische Grammatik, von TH. GARTNER. 80 pp., xlviii, 206. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1883.

Just as in the rapidly developing science of biology, the student of medicine changes the basis of his investigation with reference to the old school and studies animal life from the standpoint of living forms, so the student of modern languages turns from the fixed forms of written speech to the living dialects to study the historical growth of language in its formative period.

The paramount importance of dialectology for the proper discrimination and classification of any set of language elements is now generally recognized, and constitutes the most striking difference between the leading drift of language-study to-day and ten to fifteen years ago. Before this, the dialects were regarded as rich sources of phonetic law and morphological change, but they were not insisted upon as absolutely necessary to a correct knowledge of the diversified linguistic products which have been gradually moulded and built up into our present systems of complex speech. And nowhere else more than in the Romance languages has late dialect research proved a valuable aid in the solution of grammatical questions, beyond the reach of general principles, which, to a certain extent, are applicable to all the individual members of the group. Hitherto, scientific Romance grammar has dealt only with those literary idioms which constitute to-day the common vehicles of thought for the majority of the Neo-latin peoples. At the present time we demand of it that it represent, in a greater or less degree of fullness, the peculiarities, written and unwritten, of those divers centres of dialect influence which helped to make up the current language. It was, therefore, with a wise perception of our contemporary needs that, as far back as 1878, a movement was set on foot in Germany to publish a series of Romance grammars that should fully embody the spirit and method of research characteristic of the existing state of these studies. The collaborators in the enterprise have worked steadily for five years in the various departments of the field to which they were assigned, and the first to offer us the results of his labors is Prof. Gartner, of Vienna, in his *Raetoromanische Grammatik*, a veritable wonder of untiring patience and industry, and a fine model of scientific dialect investigation. To collect the materials for his work, the author received, first, a year's leave of absence from his academic duties, during which time he travelled over the whole language-territory, noting carefully the differences of idiom on the spot; and then a second term of the same length was granted him to work up his linguistic stock. How well he has done the latter, out of an enormous wealth of forms, no one will be able to appreciate better than the Romance scholar who has

worked himself into the multiform types of the Raetian language through the author's predecessors.

Here, for the first time, we find material covering a total of seventy-six different points in the language-territory, sifted, selected, and distributed in so lucid a manner, both with reference to the spoken and written idiom, and to the different ages of the same, that the scholar can seize with little trouble the main lines of development of the collective group. The territory itself, in its limitations and divisions, is treated in an independent way, and is considerably retrenched as compared with the extent given to it by Ascoli. The latter laid much stress upon the relation of the Raetoromance to the Italian, which Gartner very wisely overlooks, confining himself closely to the domain that he is dealing with, and leaving the other outside idioms to be located in the special grammars that are to follow. In addition, however, to the principal varieties of purely Raetian speech which are constantly compared, and their agreements and differences scrupulously marked, the neighboring *mischdialekte* are taken into account, and form the chief factor in the make-up of those interesting relations that exist between this and more settled types of language. It is to be hoped that the fitting appellation—*Raetoromanisch*—proposed and used throughout this work to denote the whole body of Raetian dialects, will be adopted by scholars generally, and thus end the discussion with reference to the most suitable name for them. The prestige, however, of Ascoli's name, especially in Italy, will be likely to keep up for some time yet his favorite technical term, Ladinian, as applicable to the entire class, and, in this way, lead to confusion. An appropriate restriction, it would seem, of the meaning of this term, which has almost universally crept into works on Raetian philology, would be that used by Ulrich in his *Raetoromanische Chrestomathie*, where it is applied exclusively to the language and literature of the Inn valley as contrasted with the Upper Rhine.

The triple geographical division of the territory into the Grisons, Tyrol, and Friuli species is handy for reference, and the different districts thus easily distinguished by separate and marked characteristics of language. They represent a comparatively limited section on the map of Europe, and the half million of inhabitants comprised in it are not sufficiently strong in commerce or other material pursuits to make them of great importance, were it not for the peculiar position their language holds with reference to the German on the one hand, and to its sister dialect, the Italian (Lombard and Venetian), on the other. Lodged, for the most part, in mountainous regions, where they were shut off from many of the influences that produce changes in the speech of plains and valleys, they have preserved numerous interesting specimens, both in phonology and morphology, of an archaic stage of linguistic forms. Then, again, in the apparently heterogeneous jumble of German and Romance elements in the Grisons and Tyrol divisions, we discover laws of change and interchange which are developed according to fixed principles, and which throw light on what must have been the condition of things in the French proper at the time of the Teutonic invasions. But in the Raetian, of course, the grip of the foreign element has never been loosened by absence of contact, and hence its potential influence becomes the more marked in cases where neither assimilation nor absorption was possible. In all cases, however, the

.

rank and file of grammar categories have stuck to the direct line of Latin tradition, and have not swerved from it even in parts of the field where they have been beaten back and have given place to the numerically superior forces of the German.

For all these provinces of the present Raetian domain, the author thinks that he has discovered a gradual tendency to fall away before their more powerful neighbors. Among the Grisons, traces of the physical influence of the Lombard are clearly manifest in the language; but the border dialects, being numerous and very diverse in character, present a very strong concentrated drift towards italianization. On the North it is different. Here the Teutonic power is predominant, and favored, moreover, by the natural configuration of the country, the ultimate displacement of the Romance idioms of the upper Inn and Rhine by the Swiss German is almost certain. In the Tyrol it is the Venetian which is eating into the Raetian territory and little by little driving out the original idiom, while in Friuli the overwhelming pressure of the Italian written language, backed by exclusive official sanction, makes a prediction with reference to the future of this species comparatively easy.

The word-supply of the Raetian dialect set is characteristic in that we find here, besides the ordinary types common to the whole body of Romance speech, a large number of specific Latin forms that exist only in these mountainous districts. It is the western member of the group (the Grisons) that abounds especially in these unique creations, and for this reason as well as for the varied mould of its grammar-classes, its peculiar phrase-settings, and superior literary importance, it offers greater interest to the investigator than either of the other representatives of this stock.

For the phonology, those points are specially noted in this treatise which are common to all the leading dialects, and the chief varieties of sound that belong to the several subdialects and mixed dialects are registered according to a system which enables one to see at a glance where they stand, both with reference to the general phonological phenomena of the set and of any individual member belonging to it. The bulk of phonetic alterations and differences in any given set of dialects thus becomes specialized, and by contrast may be sketched in the mind of the student with more clearness and sharpness of outline. Here the author follows a strict qualitative analysis of the different sound-products, and only treats their quantitative relations as they are affected by the various mechanical processes of prosthesis and aphaeresis, epenthesis and syncope, epithesis and apocope. Abundant material is furnished in the texts cited and in the word-of-mouth examples for further and more detailed research into any particular phase of Raetian phonology.

The writer acts the part rather of a pioneer in this branch of his subject, laying down the main lines of investigation that are to be carried out with reference to it, and leaving to others the business of elucidating special and peculiar aspects of it. But it is in the department of morphology where we meet with the greatest originality of treatment and the most extensive array of facts adduced to verify, step by step, the processes of evolution that glide into one another almost imperceptibly in this immense mass of material. For every one of sixty-seven dialect centres, the author's lexicological collection contains three hundred and fifty articles, and for each of his nine *masterdialekte*

he has 1400 articles. The fund of material thus brought together is large enough to trace the life-history of all forms of importance ; and so far as certain grammatical orders are concerned, such as the verb, we now have a sufficiently complete scheme to represent all the successive stages of growth, from the earliest written records down to the latest variation of the spoken language. In the West alone are found interesting remnants of the dual-case period of Romance speech, of the neuter gender as an independent grammar form, and of the displacement of accent in certain plural formations (*lâtro*—*latrónes*). For an explanation of special types of this last class, the author is disposed to agree with Prof. Förster, who holds (*Zeitschr. f. r. Philol.* III 566) to the bold theory that alongside of the termination *o*, *onem*, *ones*, there existed another of like character and formation, *a*, *anem*, *anes*, and from the latter he would take such examples as *Donauns*, *Mattauns*, etc.

The ordinary telescoping of Romance grammar forms under the influence of accent and euphony is carefully brought out, and home-grown words are sharply distinguished throughout the work from imported products. It is, however, in the department of the verb that our author has made the most exhaustive collection of forms, and for his nine principal dialects the list is probably well-nigh perfect. Here, more than anywhere else, is the investigator made to feel that, in the plastic period of language, every writer is a full-fledged grammarian. The shifts often resorted to by an author at this time to have a grammar form of his own in preference to that of some one else, is thoroughly characteristic of a stage of language that has not yet cast off its swaddling clothes, and where the supporters of the literary element do not hesitate to snub the patrons of popular speech by rejecting the traditional types of thought-expression, and, in many cases, substituting therefor bungling, uncouth neologisms. For the conjugation scheme we have the common strong and weak verb classes, and, in addition to these, another comprising two divisions, which the author would call *überschwach*. The first of these belongs exclusively to the A-conjugation, is peculiar to the Rhine valley, and is distinguished by wedging in between the root and termination the notable device *-edy-*, which is developed out of *eg*, *ec*, before a vowel and represents the classic *-ic*. The second division covers the simple inchoative suffix *-sc*, which, instead of being hedged in by the limits of the fourth conjugation, is extended to the A-forms in the Grisons, and offers us some points of special interest. Besides the regular legitimate tenses that have been preserved from the Latin, viz. the present and imperfect indicative and the pluperfect subjunctive, the sixteenth and seventeenth century authors, in particular, garnished their respective idioms with a multitude of derivative Latin tense-forms, that clogged and hampered the natural growth by giving it such variety as to prove a burden rather than a help in the expression of thought.

Mussafia, in an article (*Zur Praesensbildung im Romanischen*) published last April in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, treats the most noteworthy phases of growth in the present tense, and here we find the first person plural of the I-conjugation taken in tow by *sumus* throughout the Tyrolese territory, and by *habemus* in the Grisons. In the Piemontese dialect and in French we find the first of these processes common to the whole group of verbs ; in the Venetian and Lombard dialects the second is followed out. For the

imperfect, it is the Engadine alone that does not stick to the traditional Latin form, *e. g. putreva*. The author has very conveniently arranged all the irregular verbs according to the Latin type; for example, sub *ire, vadere*, we find not only the regular conjugation, but also all the forms collected in the order of person and number, with their numerous equivalents and the dates of their use.

A most valuable supplement, covering twenty-one pages, and a good register end the book. In the former we have placed before us a large number of common words, such as *aqua, bene, bonus, casa, clavis*, and the numerals, running through fifty strictly Raetian and nineteen neighboring dialects. The dialectologist must be fastidious indeed who would not be satisfied with this extraordinary mass of material, where he can study both form and phonetics for almost every shading of every dialect belonging to the group. All moot points touching the language are left unnoticed, and the syntax is not treated at all in this grammar.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound*, with Notes and an Introduction, by R. H. MATHER, of Amherst College. Boston, John Allyn, 1883.

No play is better adapted than the *Prometheus* for use with a class beginning Greek tragedy, and we are prepared to welcome warmly an edition which shall give us the results of the philological study of this play since the publication of President Woolsey's judicious edition, of which the plates now are badly worn. The edition before us contains so much that is good, mainly gathered from different sources, that we hesitate to pronounce it faulty, both in plan and in execution. This judgment seems necessary, however, when we examine the work in detail. If the book did not bear evident marks of elaboration we should ascribe many statements therein to carelessness; if the editor had not been teaching Greek at Amherst College for a quarter of a century, many errors would be ascribed to ignorance. On 806 he translates Πλούτωνος πόρον as 'the ford of Pluto'; spoiling the sense gratuitously, for no translation is needed in the note. He writes, on 725, of the Amazons who 'shall inhabit Themiscyra about Thermodon,' where few boys would imagine that 'Thermodon' was a river, on the banks of which the Amazons were to dwell. An error so inexcusable that we must ascribe it to the demon of the press, although it more closely resembles a freshman's blunder, is in the note on 452; κατώρυχες is translated "burrows or dugout." The printer's devil clearly took this word for a noun.

The editor drops into etymologies occasionally, but generally is unfortunate. Sometimes he drags in an etymology against his will. Thus on σφίγγε, v. 58, he is led to mention the Sphinx, and proceeds to connect that word with the English *fox*, referring to Curtius. But Curtius dropped this as untenable at least as early as the last edition of his "Etymology," in 1879. The editor forgets the Attic use of παρελθεῖν, and neglects the natural contrast with the Exodos, when he says that the Parodos of the chorus was so named "because the chorus entered from the side of the stage." On 733 he says that Βόσπορος is "properly Ox-ford," but at once "hedges" by adding, not quite clearly, that "probably this derivation is confined to Aeschylus, and has no philological connection with the myth of Io; for in all other compounds of βοῦς the diphthong is retained."

A characteristic note is that on v. 680: "Argus was killed by Hermes with a stone, who was from this exploit called 'Αργειφόντης. Hera placed Argus' hundred eyes in the tail of a peacock. This tradition as well as that concerning the manner of his death goes to show that the whole story was symbolically connected with the peacock, the sacred bird of India." It is unnecessary to remind the readers of this Journal how distinctly the drift of philological opinion has led toward the belief that this byname of Hermes had nothing to do with Argus. It would have been better for the editor to have said nothing about "a stone," for the form of the myth according to which Hermes killed Argus with his sword, seems to have been at least as prevalent. What the editor adds about the peacock's tail might better have been reserved for the class-room. That the peacock is the "sacred bird of India" seems to be untrue. Moreover, the Argus-myth does not deserve to be called a "tradition." Of this note, then, only the first five words are true and in their right place.

Another unfortunate note is that on 458, where the editor speaks of "the difficulty of distinguishing between the true setting of a star and its apparent or heliacal setting, when, by its nearness to the sun, it is rendered invisible by its superior brightness." The confusion here is all in the editor's mind; in themselves, the heliacal and the daily settings cannot be confounded. The editor's mistake is the less excusable since he refers to Blakesley's Herodotus (a book which is in the hands of few students), where the matter is clearly stated.

The editor not infrequently strays from the point which is to be explained or illustrated. When Oceanus says, v. 290, that the tie of blood constrains him to sympathize with the misfortunes of Prometheus, the editor tells us: "The laws of kinship were very binding. The plots of many of the Greek tragedies are based on the principle that children must avenge the wrongs of their parents." So on 129: "These archaic forms [of the Doric dialect] had been so long used in choral worship that the Greeks came to love the dialect as essential to the service, and hence insisted on retaining it; just as the Ephesians preferred the ugly old idol in their great temple of Artemis to the finest statue of the goddess completed in later times, and as some persons at the present day consider it almost profanation to correct even the grammatical errors in King James' version of the Bible." And again, on the same page: "This training by Oceanus of his children to be retiring and respectful is quite in contrast with certain modern manners of the young." The crowning absurdity into which the editor is led by his desire to make a chatty text-book is his note on v. 91, where the mention of the sun suggests the idea of sun-worship (which was not in the mind of Aeschylus), and this leads him to the statue of the sun-god at Rhodes, "the Colossus, seventy feet high, that bestrode the harbor." The harbor of Rhodes is not far from 700 feet wide at the narrowest part, and it would have been interesting if Professor Mather had added an illustration of his "Colossus, seventy feet high," bestriding it. The use of *feet* for *cubits* probably was a slip of the pen. If the editor's imagination had been stronger, it would have served him here in good stead. The imperfect development of his representative faculty has led him to other ludicrous positions. He tells us, on v. 561, that it is impossible to decide positively whether Io was represented upon the stage as "a heifer with a woman's head, furnished with horns, or simply as a woman with horns." But he reminds us that "the



Athenians did not hesitate to make the hideous, revolting centaurs prominent in the noblest art," and that on a bas-relief, Io was represented as changed into a cow. He elsewhere speaks of her "revolting form," and we see that he thinks it at least possible that the actor who had played the part of Oceanus came in as a quadruped and curveted over the stage like a calf. He cuts himself off from refuge to the view that the quadruped may not have frisked about, by saying in the Introduction, p. xxxvii, that "the frantic efforts of Io to get away from her tormentor would seem to require more room for the performance of her part than the limits of a small balcony would furnish." His argument from the centaurs is without point, since we are not informed of their introduction upon the tragic stage. He does not seem to have borne in mind the boundary lines between the drama and painting and sculpture, an oblivion which is the more peculiar since he has lectured, we believe, in the School of Art at Smith College. We are tempted to believe that the editor's conception of Io as a cow led him to his interpretation of the exclamation of the chorus after the recital of Io's sufferings, v. 687, *ἐα ἐα, ἀπεχε, φεῦ*, which he translates "*keep (her) off.*" Evidently these maidens share the well-known fear of their sex for *horned cattle*, and it seems to be hard fate which leaves them no male protector except Prometheus, chained to the rock. This shows that Aeschylus had studied carefully the feminine mind. The editor's comment on this exclamation is only slightly different: "This is addressed to *Pro.* by the chorus, whose purity is shocked by the story of Io, and they wish to avoid all contact with such an accursed creature." It is the editor and not the poet who speaks of the "sin of Io."


The editor's language is often inexact. He gives the name *stichomythy* to the dialogue between Kratos and Hephaestus, where he himself remarks that "it will be observed that Hephaestus confines himself to a single verse *while Kratos employs two.*" He offends mortally against good taste by always abbreviating the name Prometheus to *Pro.* We have not chanced to find a passage where this has saved any space.

A note on Dodona, on v. 830, occupies more than half a page. The editor's authority for the site is Col. Leake, whose Travels were published in 1835, who believed the site of the ancient oracle to be at the southern extremity of the lake Janina. Professor Mather evidently is ignorant of the excavations conducted several years ago by Carapanos, whose elaborate account of them in two volumes was published in 1878. Nearly fifty inscriptions pertaining to the oracle, most of them being questions addressed to Zeus and Dione, leave no doubt that the oracle was situated on a projecting knoll, near the middle of the valley of Tcharacovista. A dozen miles one way or another in the position of Dodona make little difference to the college student, but the perhaps groundless suspicion is excited that the scholar who has never heard of the discoveries there is not well read in modern philological literature and may not be prepared to make a satisfactory edition of a Greek play. We are reminded that Professor Mather edited some selections from Herodotus about ten years ago and repeated there, on Hdt. VII 213, the old view that the Amphictyonic Council met in the spring at Delphi and in the autumn at Thermopylae; while inscriptions found at Delphi, and the Funeral Oration of Hyperides, which was discovered in an Egyptian tomb, proved years before to the general satisfaction of scholars

that the Council in both spring and fall met at Thermopylae, its original seat, and then proceeded to Delphi. This error has been repeated since Professor Mather's publication by two other American editors.

Seldom are so many philological errors brought together and soberly enunciated as on some of the pages of the introduction, on the representation of Greek plays. The editor has much delightful knowledge. He knows to a foot the width of the middle door of the stage and the exact arrangement of the mask and mouthpiece. He knows that the stage was provided with a curtain and how it was managed. He tells us that the plays of Euripides required frequent change of scene. But unfortunately he is not always consistent. On p. xx he says that the poet "more than compensated" for the simplicity of the plot of the Prometheus, and for the lack of action, "by the wild grandeur of the scenery," etc., while on p. xxxiv we read that "the stage illusions must have been very imperfect. In such large open-air amphitheatres [*sic*] they used scenery simply to suggest the interpretation of the play, expecting the imagination of the spectators to supply the rest." Why the editor's pen should have slipped into the word *amphitheatres* it is not easy to see.

The editor avoids everything that savors of scholarship; he gives no parallel passages for illustration, even on *πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἐκτενεῖς* merely referring to Acts ix. 5. He dodges the question of the marriage of the nymphs, v. 901, and does not explain the allusion to the trident of Poseidon, v. 925, which ought to be illustrated from Pindar's eighth Isthmian Ode. In general, he wisely avoids the mention of the names of scholars who have edited this play. When he breaks this rule, the result is sometimes disastrous, as on 887: "Paley and Wecklein refer here to the proverb said to have originated with Pittacus of Mytilene, *τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα*." This reference to the Englishman and German shows that the editor did not know that they took the note from the later *scholiast*; and on 560 his expression, "in *Buttmann's* Scholia," etc., implies that his study of the old commentators has been superficial.

Curiously enough, the treatment of the lyric parts of the Prometheus in this volume is not by Professor Mather, but "by an arrangement of the publisher," the metrical introduction and schemes were prepared by Professor Gould, on the system of J. H. H. Schmidt. The notation is the most convenient, and teachers will be glad of these schemes, although they may be unwilling to adopt unreservedly the principle of eurhythm which is made so prominent here. The metrical editor seems to differ from Professor Mather in his interpretation of one passage. One line, v. 117, *ἵκετο τερμόνιον ἐπὶ πάγον*, is severely strained to make it bacchiic, while little if anything is gained by this treatment. It is probably a misprint which, in the definition of the cyclic dactyl, p. 131, makes it equal to .

A teacher with this edition might make his recitations interesting and profitable, sharpening on the notes the critical faculties of his class. For this use, probably undesigned by the editor, the book seems well fitted. Otherwise it is not adapted to class-room use. It assumes that the student has no teacher or, at least, receives no instruction, and it anticipates the work of the class-room so far as the editor can. To a student who reads the play without a teacher, this edition gives much that is interesting, combined with various errors.



Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, mit Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins, als Vorarbeit zu einem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae mit Unterstützung der K. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Herausgegeben von EDUARD WÖLFFLIN. Erster Jahrgang. Heft 1. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884.

There can be no difference of opinion as to the significance of this undertaking, which seems destined to usher in a new era in Latin lexicography, and to give a new impetus to the study of Latin in general. It has been easy to find fault with the dictionaries of the past. They were often the work of mere compilers without scholarship, who repeated the errors of their predecessors and added new ones of their own. The meanings assigned to words were poorly classified and sadly inadequate, while the citations but too frequently proved a mere mockery. At their best estate they represented very imperfectly the rich resources of the Latin language in its various periods of development. Even with the best abilities and the most conscientious and untiring effort, such as we must concede to Georges and a few eminent lexicographers, the task has proved too great for the strength of one man. What was needed was the combined effort of a large number of well-trained scholars, working with a single purpose, under the direction of some wise leader, each one confining his attention to a limited portion of the whole field to be surveyed, but viewing this with an almost microscopic scrutiny. We cannot but admire the courage of Prof. Wölfflin, who, undaunted by the difficulties in the way, has settled upon a plan of organization, and has already engaged over two hundred scholars to aid him in the enterprise.

His name alone furnishes us a guaranty that nothing will be omitted to secure thoroughness and accuracy. In a brief preface he explains the nature of the undertaking and outlines the plan of operation. The Latin literature down to the time of Charlemagne, and in exceptional cases even later, is to be included; and not simply the literature, but also inscriptions and glossaries, laws, charters and diplomas. Not only the cases of occurrence of a word are to be noted, but also its total absence or rare use in an author. For example, the fact that *avere* occurs sixteen times in the letters to Atticus, and only twice in Cicero's orations (and that, too, in the Philippics), prepares us to believe that the word belongs rather to the *sermo familiaris*; and the fact that neither Caesar nor Sallust employs it is significant. Hence, the sphere of a word's use must be more distinctly defined, whether it belongs more to poetry or to prose, to early or late Latin, to the vulgar or refined speech, and even whether a particular author (like Cicero or Tacitus) uses it more frequently in his early than in his late works. When a word becomes rare or obsolete, it must be noted what are the expressions which contend with it for the possession of an idea, and which finally crowd it out. Orthography, prosody, syntactical construction, normal and peculiar forms, peculiar meanings, exceptional position in the sentence, must all receive attention.

The whole field has been divided into some 250 sections, for nearly all of which scholars have been found to assume the responsibility. For the next three years, a 'Frage Zettel' is to be issued in each semester, containing about forty questions, the answers to which are to be forwarded to the Archiv before

a fixed date. The present number of the Archiv contains eighty of these questions. Questions 1-10 ask for data in regard to words beginning with *a*, from *abacus* to *abarceo*; 41-50, from *abavia* to *abductio*. As specimens of the more general questions we cite:

13, Alle Subst. u. Adject. auf *aster* (*astrum*, *astellus*). Sollte die Ableitung nicht in malam partem zu verstehen sein, so ist dies ausdrücklich zu bemerken (August. civ. d. 2, 27 *vir gravis et philosophaster Cicero*.) Ital. *astro*, franz. *être* bezeichnen bekanntlich nur noch die Aehnlichkeit.

21, *trans*. Beispiele nebst Accus. u. Verb. auszuschreiben. Ist *trans* konsequent vermieden (wie z. B. Curtius ausschliesslich nur *ultra* mit Flussnamen verbunden), so ist ein leerer Zettel einzulegen, mit der bemerkung 'fehlt.'

52. Die mit *in* privativum zusammengesetzten Substantiva von denen das vorauszusetzende Adjektiv nicht vorkommt; z. B. *inedia*, *indoloria*, etc.

59. Was heisst *umsonst*? z. B. *frustra*, *nequiquam*, *in cassum*, *in vanum* (en vain).

72. *Ut quid* = *quare*, wozu? wie Cic. Attic. 7, 7, 7. *Depugna, inquis, potiusquam servias. Ut quid?* etc. Ellipse von *fiat*, wie bei *iva rí*; häufig im Spätlatein und Mittellatein. Rönsch, Ital. s. 253.

The Archiv itself will be open to contributions of a lexical and grammatical character, and to *miscellanea* and notices of recent publications in the same field. The present number contains several such articles which will be found very stimulating and suggestive reading. Loewe contributes fresh material from the Glossaries; Gröber discusses with much learning the "Sprachquellen und Wortquellen des lateinischen Wörterbuchs." He recognizes the Romance languages as a source from which new Latin words and forms may be inferred. He claims distinctly that the vulgar Latin never died out as a mother-tongue, although for convenience it is important to set a limit between the vulgar Latin and its modern descendants, as it is convenient to distinguish between Anglo-Saxon and English. He attempts to settle approximately the period in which the feeling for correct Latin as a literary instrument was lost in France, Spain and Italy. From Thielmann's article we gain an idea of how much is still to be gleaned from the study of Bible-latin. The Latinity of Gaius is discussed by Wilh. Kalb, and some interesting facts are brought out. We see, for example, how the eminent jurist, for the sake of clearness, avoids ellipses which are elsewhere common. He never uses *pro rata* for *pro rata parte*, *dimidia* for *dimidia pars*, *fera* for *fera bestia*, *alternis* for *alternis (vicibus, diebus, etc.)*, always preferring the fuller form. He repeats the substantive with the relative, *eiusdem condicionis*, *cuius condicionis*, regularly uses *catenus*—*quatenus*, avoids verbs derived from comparatives, as *certiorare*, *meliorare*, found in other jurists. Wölfflin himself supplements his well-known treatise on Latin and Romance comparison, by remarks on the use of *magne*, *magnopere*, *summe*, *multum* (Ital. *molto*), *valde*, *fortiter*, *bene*, *male*, *prime*, *cum primis*, *plane*; *prorsus*, *nimis*, *perfecte*, and other intensive adverbs. On p. 95 *adplene* is compared with the Ital. *appieno*. Here we think Donatus' use of *ad plenum* as a synonym for *perfecte* might have been mentioned. It has apparently escaped the notice of lexicographers, And. II 3, 4 (*perspicere est ad plenum et perfecte videre*), cf. And. II 6, 16 already given by Georges, and And. II 4, 3. We cannot accept Schenkl's proposal (p. 101) to emend Calpurnius, Ecl. 4, 63, *Montibus Hyblaea moduiabile*

*carmen avena*, by reading *carmen modulatus avena*, and to strike *modulabilis* out of the lexica. We have noted it in Scholia Bernensia (Hagen, p. 793), Ecl. VI, Introduction, "*haec ecloga modulabilis est*," and further search will very likely discover it elsewhere.

Buecheler brings a grist of new words in the "Miscellen," pp. 102-14, supported with his usual ingenuity, and restores beyond appeal *mordicibus* to Aul. 234, *telinum* to Curc. 100, and *insegesti* to Truc. 314. Studemund furnishes some interesting notes on *Aestumo*, *Exobsecro*, *Ungulaster Lectina*. The rest of the number is chiefly occupied with book notices. We bespeak for this new undertaking the heartiest encouragement on the part of American scholars. Surely if there is any work which progressive Latinists cannot do without, it is this.

M. WARREN.

A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes.  
By HENRY DUNBAR, M. D., Edinburgh. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press,  
1883.

There is a pathetic interest attending this book. We learn from an introductory note by Prof. Geddes, of Aberdeen, that the compiler, Dr. Dunbar, died soon after having written the preface, having, it may be presumed, seen the work through the press. Though this review may be in some respects unfavorable, it would be as unjust as foolish not to recognize gratefully the immense amount of labor which must have been bestowed upon it, and the extent to which it must facilitate the work of all persons who may hereafter occupy themselves with the language of Aristophanes. As it is not an index, but a concordance, in which the words used by the poet are not merely referred to, but quoted with their setting, the compilation of it must have necessitated the copying out of every line in the plays and fragments as many times as the lines contain words other than personal pronouns, forms of the article, and the particles. These last it would have been well to include, at least to a considerable extent; yet to none of them, with the single exception, it is believed, of *ἐως*, has Dr. Dunbar given more than a line or two, contenting himself with grouping all the remaining instances of their occurrence under a comprehensive "*κ. τ. λ.*" In this respect alone is the present work less useful than the Index of Caravella, which professes to give, and, so far as has been observed, actually gives a reference to each separate occurrence of every single word. For *μή* Dr. Dunbar quotes two lines only, while Caravella refers to about 550 instances of *μή* and nearly 100 of *μή*. To have treated all the particles with absolute completeness would no doubt have materially increased the size of the book; but some kind of judicious compromise might have been made, and space might have been gained by compression in other directions; for instance, by reducing the number of lines quoted as containing *μὰ Δία* or *νῆ Δία*, which fill nearly three pages.

Prof. Geddes predicts that this is a book "which will not be superseded for two hundred years." It is not unlikely that his vaticination will prove correct. But if so much labor was to be expended on a work of this kind, it was in the highest degree desirable that the plan on which it was to be executed should be the result of mature consideration; and Prof. Geddes, when he suggested

to Dr. Dunbar the compilation of a concordance to Aristophanes, would have done well to point out to him that a concordance would be more valuable than an index, exactly in so far as it might furnish students with the means of getting at once some insight into the meaning and usage of a word, by quoting it along with so much of its environment as would indicate its sense and grammatical relations. Dr. Dunbar has imposed upon himself a purely mechanical rule of citation. He quotes the whole of a line in which a word occurs, neither more nor less; and this rule leads, in the case of a writer like Aristophanes, to numberless citations which are as grotesque in appearance as they are useless for purposes of interpretation or syntactical appreciation. When one finds, for example, "θαρρήσας, I. 623; τιστε, θ. λέγ' ὡς ᾱ-," it may not perhaps be hard to divine that the syllable βέλ- must occur in the preceding line; but what does ᾱ- suggest as to the following line? Under Μανῆς we find: "Λ. 1212, ρούς. ὁ Μ. δ'." Who shall say of what word ρούς forms a part? or how is the quotation more helpful than if it told us simply that Μανῆς occurs in the given line? Under καδίσκους we have: "Σ. 321: μῶν ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς κ." Who would guess that μῶν here is not the interrogative particle, but the last syllable of ὑμῶν? Countless instances might be adduced of the unhappy results of rigid adherence to this purely mechanical rule. Analogous infelicities are due to the determination that every word shall find its place in the vocabulary exactly as it occurs in its line, no regard being paid to the accidental modifications it may have undergone in consequence of the influence of its immediate neighbors. If one should desire to ascertain what forms of the verb ἐκπίνω were employed by Aristophanes, the information could not be gained from this concordance, unless one should happen to think that καί might be combined with it, and so look for κάκπීමαι. Similarly, to learn the forms of βουλεύω which occur we must not miss ἀβουλεύσαμεν on the first page; for the usage of ἐκκλησία we must not fail to find three instances of its occurrence under ἡκκλησία and nine more under τῆκκλησία. A verb like ἐρχομαι must probably, when once the system of the ordinary lexicons is abandoned, involve more or less trouble; but one would not expect to find one of its forms between λήψομαι and λίαν; and yet it stands there in the shape of 'λθοι. We find one of the forms of ἀγαθός under τύχ'ἀγαθῇ, and another under ὦγαθέ. To learn completely the Aristophanic employment of ἔρρειν we must find 'ρρήσεθ'; of ἐσθίω, we must look out 'σθιε. These instances, which might be added to indefinitely, will suffice to show to how great an extent the plan adopted by Dr. Dunbar, and so faithfully carried out, must interfere with the usefulness of his work. In the preface to his Concordance to the Odyssey he tells us, among other things, that "words of the same lettering, but of different meaning, are kept apart, as θεός, a god, θεός, a goddess; παῖδα, a son, παῖδα, a daughter." In the present work he has not observed this rule, but has neglected it even in some cases where it would appear highly desirable that it should be adhered to. For instance, under πλεῖν there are eighteen citations, in thirteen of which the word is the comparative (πλείον), and in five, which are mixed indiscriminately with the others, it is the infinitive of πλέω. The compiler appears also to have followed his copy (Dindorf's Oxford edition of 1835) with too scrupulous an exactness. We find, for example, on p. 125, "ἔχεν. Λ. 791, καὶ κύνα τιν' ἐ," and that this is not merely a misprint is shown by the fact that under κύνα, on p. 179, the same mistake

occurs. On p. 239 we find between *παρ'* and *παρά* "*πάρ'*. Εκ. 700, *αὐτῆς κ. ἐμοί*," which was probably a misprint in Dindorf's text faithfully reproduced here.

The faults discernible in this book are due to the exact carrying out of a plan originally unfortunate, and to the failure to exercise an independent judgment upon the text which was used as its basis. But the execution of the book itself is nearly, if not quite, perfect. Of the many references examined, not a single erroneous citation has been detected. A few words, indeed, are omitted; but there can be no doubt that the phraseology of Aristophanes is made accessible to the student by this concordance to a degree which leaves very little to be desired.

C. D. MORRIS.

---

Bifrun's Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments (Vorworte, Ev. Matthaei, Ev. Marci). Pp. vi, 199, small 8vo. Herausgegeben von JAKOB ULRICH. Halle, Niemeyer, 1883.

For several years past, some of the best Romance scholars have been zealously working to throw light upon the language and literature of the Rhaetian people. Extracts from the old sixteenth and seventeenth century literature, grammatical treatises, vocabularies and collections of folk lore have been published in rapid succession, but the student was not supplied with full working materials covering the whole history of this set of Romance dialects, until the publication, in 1882, of Dr. Ulrich's *Rhaetoromanische Chrestomathie* in two octavo volumes, with glossary and notes (Niemeyer). Prof. Boehmer, of Strassburg, the leader in these studies in Europe, has given us, in the *Romanische Studien*, many rare and valuable works from his rich library of Rhaetian texts, but they could not be drawn upon to show the connected and peculiar growth of the entire body of Rhaetioromance literature. In the philology of the language, on the other hand, Ascoli's celebrated treatise, *Studii Ladini*, could not be used with solid profit by the student without having at his command some of the sources from which the materials were taken for the author's exhaustive treatment of the phonetic system. It is to supply both of these serious needs that the editor of the Bifrun translation has begun the publication of a series of original works, in five volumes, under the general title *Rhaetoromanische Texte*, the second volume of which now lies before us and represents the Upper Engadine dialect. The first number of this important collection contains the chief literary monuments of the Nidwald dialect; the third will reproduce Chiampel's *Psalter* (1562) in the Lower Engadine idiom, while the fourth will give us Stephan Gabriel's well-known *Ver Sulaz* (1612) in the Obwald language. In the fifth volume we are to have a grammar based upon the foregoing texts, a glossary for the whole, and a special treatment, for the first time, of the science of word-building for all Rhaetian dialects.

The oldest printed work, but one, in Rhaetian, is this translation by Bifrun in 1560, of the New Testament into the Ober-Engadine idiom, with the title "*L'g Nuof Sainc Testament da nos Signer IESV CHRISTL. Prais our delg Latin & our d'oters launguax & huossa da noef mis in Arumanssch, 376 Iachiam Bifrun d'Agredina. Sschquischo (Poschiavo) ilg an 1560.*" We have

a second edition of the same brought out in 1607 by Luzi Papa, one of the bright lights of Early Rhaetian literature. A short introduction by Filip Saluz (commonly known as Philippus Gallizius, the Rhaetian Luther), a letter from Erasmus bearing upon the version, and an interesting preface by the author, touching the difficulties of translation into so unstable a language as his vernacular, serve to prepare the reader for the now free, now literal, and oftentimes peculiar rendition of the original. The author probably made use of Sebastian Castalion's Latin Bible, published at Bale in 1556. In his annotations that follow each chapter we discover the zealous reformer, and those striking characteristics of mind which, as a jurist and theologian, naturally made him a special friend of Zwingli. The editor has given us here, as indicated above, the gospel according to St. Matthew and St. Mark only, and it was his intention that it should be a faithful reprint, but numerous misprints have crept into it, which were almost unavoidable in a work of this sort, and a list of them with the necessary corrections is, therefore, very properly added at the end of the volume. But besides these we find a series of text emendations, of which a part are superfluous, and another part out of place. If the original is faithfully reproduced, we have its list of corrections that are sufficient without adding them *de novo*, and the second class *gegen das original* might be worth considering as suggestions for textual criticism, but they injure the individuality of the work when they are thus introduced into the body of it and substituted for the primitive readings. The language itself of the translation represents that plastic stage of linguistic development that is so marked in the celebrated Musso-War epic, the author of which, Gian Travers, died only three years after the first edition of this New Testament version was published. At this time the Ladinian was considered, if not the oldest, certainly the purest dialect of the Rhaetian language, and hence graphic signs to represent its phonetic system were naturally invented here first and transmitted to the sister idioms, and the earliest printed works also in the Rhaetian were executed for this dialect species. The typographical workmanship of this volume is well done, and especially the various diacritical signs of the dialect are given with a precision that is highly creditable to the celebrated house that has published it.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

---

*Studia Terentiana.* SCR. AUG. GODFR. ENGELBRECHT. Vienna, 1883. 90 pp.

This interesting treatise is mainly concerned with a comparison of Plautus and Terence in respect to their use of forms. Many of the single points taken up have already been treated with more or less fulness, but nowhere have the differences been so skillfully grouped together or presented in so striking a light. Starting out with the uniform testimony of the ancients to the purity of Terence's diction, which was held to be quite worthy of a Scipio or a Laelius, the writer proceeds to show that very many vulgar and archaic forms used by Plautus were distinctly avoided by Terence, and that in not a few instances the critics have indiscreetly thrust into the text forms which were actually foreign to the later poet. Moreover, he is careful to point out that the difference between the two poets is one not simply of age, but of mental attitude. Terence was a conscious artist in words. He aimed to represent as far as was



possible, for the purposes of comedy, the language of the cultivated circle in which he moved. He avowedly lays claim to *pura oratio*. His standard in so far as was higher than that of Plautus, and whatever may have been the loss in comic power, there is a distinct gain in urbanity. So Terence in many points seems to anticipate, as it were, the usage of Cicero, while his contemporaries, poets of coarser mould, keep closer to Plautus.

A summary of the results reached by the investigation is given on pp. 75-9. Of these we can only mention a few. Terence has no ablatives in *-d*, no genitives in *ai*, no nominative plurals of *-o* stems in *-is*, no futures of the third conjugation like *reddibo*. He avoids forms like *med*, *ted*, *mis*, *tis*, *ibur*, *hibur*, *dantur*, *homōnis*, *simitu*, *interibi*, *dehibeo*, *praehibeo*, *bactere* (despite Leo, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXXVIII, p. 24). Moreover, Engelbrecht disputes the right of the following forms to be considered as Terentian: *puere* (Fleckeisen, *Eun.* 624), *itere* (Bentley, *Phorm.* 566), *sortis* as nominative (Fleckeisen, *And.* 985), *isti* and *illi* as genitives (Brandt, *Eun.* 370, *Phorm.* 969, etc.), *sini* = *sini* (Fleckeisen, *And.* 188), *earumpse* (Leo, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXXVIII 11), *poste* = *post* (Fleckeisen, *And.* 483). In many cases, forms which are constantly used by Plautus are very rarely used by Terence, sometimes only in particular formulas, or in certain places in the verse. It is an interesting observation (p. 54) that in the common form of curse, *di te perduint* (*perdant*), even in Plautus, the form in *-int* only occurs at the end of a verse, or of the first half of an iambic octonarius, while elsewhere *perdant* is regularly used. Hence, in *Hec.* 134 there is no need with Bentley and Fleckeisen to change *perduint* to *faxint*, since *perdant* satisfies both metre and the common usage. Plautus is much more free than Terence in his use of active forms of verbs usually deponent in the later language. On the other hand, strange as it may seem, the number of syncopated perfect forms like *dixti*, *intellexti*, *produx*, is greater in the six plays of Terence than in the twenty plays of Plautus, and this syncopation must be set down as a characteristic of the *sermo urbanus* (*familiaris*), so that we need not be surprised to find it in the letters and orations of Cicero. Engelbrecht should have extended this comparison to other contract-forms like *docerunt* (*And.* 238), *norit*, *norat*, etc. Terence, for instance, has some forty contract-forms in the different tenses of *nosco*, while the certain examples in Plautus are comparatively few, as has been shown by Brix in his appendix to the edition of *Trinummus*, v. 1141. The adverbs in *-ter* like *fermiter*, of which Plautus has more than Terence, should have received some attention. In treating of *posthac*, it might not have been amiss to add a fact which hitherto seems to have escaped notice, that just as *antea*, which only occurs *And.* 52, is used at the end of the verse, so *postea* always occupies the same position, while in Plautus it is found most frequently, to be sure, at the end of a verse, but also at the beginning and within a verse.

In an appendix, Engelbrecht shows that in the use of the verb-forms in *-ris* and *-re*, while Plautus has thirty cases, in two hundred, of the fuller forms in *-ris*, Terence has fifty-six cases of forms in *-re* and none in *-ris*. The concluding sentence of the writer leads us to hope that we may sometime expect from him a discussion of the differences between Plautus and Terence in vocabulary, syntax and prosody. The materials for such a work are very rich, and a careful study of them cannot fail to elicit results both valuable and interesting.

M. WARREN.

Altfranzösische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von DR. WENDELIN FOERSTER.  
Heilbronn, Henninger. 1883.

Zweiter Band : Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel.  
Ein altfranzösisches Heldengedicht, herausgegeben von E. Koschwitz.

The first edition of this curious poem was published in 1836 by Francisque Michel ; later, several copies were taken from the only MS in the British Museum (King's Lib. 16 E, VIII), but in 1879 this MS was lost and has not yet been found. In 1880 a new edition was published by E. Koschwitz, who had previously contributed to the literature of this epic, especially by his publication of six Cymric and Norse versions of the same. This edition met with such approval that after only three years it has become necessary to bring out a new edition, in which the editor has turned to account the suggestions made by his critics. Opposite the critical text we have this time a diplomatic reprint in full ; in the concordance all the other versions known have been taken into consideration, and a complete glossary has been added. With reference to two important points the editor's opinion has undergone a complete change since the publication of the first edition ; in the critical text he has substituted the Île de France dialect for the Norman, making at the same time the transcription much more uniform ; and in regard to the age of the poem he is less certain than formerly, calling it no more an " Old French poem of the XIth century," but simply an " Old French epic."

Sechster Band : Das altfranzösische Rolandslied. Text von Chateauroux und Venedig VII. Herausgegeben von Wendelin Foerster.

The millennium will soon come for the ambitious student of the *Chanson de Roland* ; exact reprints of all the French versions in existence will enable him to take an active part in the critical restoration of the text without going back to the MSS. We have such a diplomatic edition of the Venice MS IV, edited by E. Koelbing, 1877, one of the Oxford MS, Digby 23, edited by E. Stengel, also a photographic facsimile reproduction of the same codex. In the present volume, W. Foerster gives us the MS of Chateauroux (formerly at Versailles), and the MS VII of Venice ; and another volume, which is soon to follow, will bring us the MSS of Paris, Cambridge and Lyons, also the so-called Lorraine fragment, and a tabular synopsis of the contents of each chapter in the various French MSS, and in those High-German, Low-German and Norse versions which can be at all used in textual criticism. Under these circumstances it may be hoped that we shall soon have a critical edition worthy of the great epic.

In regard to the whole series it is to be remarked that the original plan has been extended ; subsidiary works are in preparation, as, for instance, an Old French grammar and an Old French dictionary, for both of which there is great need, and it is to be desired that a handbook of French antiquities and a history of Old French literature will also be added.

H. C. G. V. JAGEMANN.

---

OTTO RIBBECK. *Emendationum Mercatoris Plautinae Spicilegium.* Leipzig, Edelmann, 1883. 32 pp.

As the Plautus literature grows from year to year it becomes more and more difficult for the general student of Latin to keep up with it, and yet nothing is



more quickening than to watch the progress made in the study of early Latin, to which Ritschl and his followers have given so great an impetus. New light is constantly being thrown upon problems of syntax and etymology. New words which will not find a place in our dictionaries for many years to come, are constantly being ferreted out of corrupt manuscripts, and fortified by the evidence of glossaries and scholia. In this field Ribbeck has long been an active worker, and has already gathered many sheaves. The spicilegium before us discusses questions connected with the text of the Mercator. Some fragments of Philemon are assigned with good reason to the original of Plautus, and compared with similar passages in the Mercator. The hand of the reviser is plainly pointed out in not a few places. Verse 149 is cast out along with vv. 150-65, already challenged by Ritschl, and v. 615 is expelled in company with vv. 620-4; vv. 373-5 are but a repetition of vv. 369-72, and their spurious origin is confirmed by their place in the MSS after v. 389. The reasons given for eliminating vv. 493 and 494 do not seem sufficient. Nothing could be more natural than for Eutychus to repeat the question which Charinus has before evaded. The patchwork character of the prologue had already been pointed out, and Ribbeck tries to explain how it was put together. The original pieces were vv. 1-2, 7-11, 40-6, 56-110, the others were tacked on afterward by different hands. Verses 269 f., 246, 610, 845-9, 861, 805-17 are obelized for various reasons. Cases where confusion in the MSS has arisen from *homoearcta* or *homoeotelenta* are treated on pp. 14-18; cases where some slight changes are required in the distribution of the rolls, on pp. 18-21. Ribbeck then proposes several emendations of the text, which are clever and ingenious, if not always convincing. In vv. 239 and 241 he reads, following B., *ambed edesse* and *ambed ederit*, and finds in *ambed* a form similar to *anted*, *posted*, *red*, *prod*, etc. In v. 882, for *religionem ilicobecit* of B, he proposes *religionem mi hic obiecit*. In v. 80 ff., keeping much more closely to the MSS than previous editors, he would read

Ego me invisum meo patri esse intellego  
Atque odio esse ei quod placere aequom fuit  
Amens amansque sic animum offirmo meum.

V. 312, where A has *amando enices* and B *amanda hic ē*, he restores thus, *Lysimache auctor sum ut me dmputando hic enices*. Very tempting is the reading proposed for v. 195, where B has *sublatius nequiquam mare subterfugi a tantis tempestatibus*. In v. 197 *iterum* and *med* are to be read; in v. 198, *loquere actutum; quid fit porro?*

Worthy of note also are *superatrix* proposed for v. 842, where Goetz reads *spectatrix*, Ussing *imperatrix* (*speratrix*, BCD); *concepit* (i. e. *ēcepit*) for *coēpit* in v. 533; *exemi* for *eripui* in v. 341, and finally the excellent emendation of v. 677, where B has *da sane hanc virgam lauriabit vintro* DOR. *eo*, Ribbeck reads *da sane hanc virgam lauri*. <SY. habeto.> DOR. *abi tu intro*. SY. *eo*.

In v. 524 Ribbeck proposes to read *auratam* for the unintelligible *ancillam*. In the Notes of this number we have tried to establish the reading *Apulam*.

M. WARREN.

## REPORTS.

Englische Studien. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING. IV Band. Heilbronn, 1881.

I.—The first paper, by E. Stengel, is an attempt to arrange Shakespeare's Sonnets according to a consistent plan. The order proposed by Massey is rejected, since it depends upon fanciful hypotheses and appeals to purely subjective criteria. That sonnets were arranged in series long before those of Shakespeare were published, and during the years when he must have been engaged in their composition, is proved by a glance at the collections of Watson, Daniel, Barnfield, and Griffin. In Watson's *Tears of Fancie*, published in 1593, the sonnets are arranged in strict sequence, and in fact form the stanzas of a complete poem. Daniel, whom Shakespeare condescended to imitate, arranged certain of the sonnets in his *Delia* in a regular series, those in question being Nos. 34-40 inclusive. For the convenience of his readers, Stengel has quoted the last-mentioned sonnets *in extenso* in an appendix to his article. Griffin's example is of less importance, since he seems to have followed in the footsteps of Daniel. Barnfield's sonnets are remarkable for being addressed, like the first 126 of Shakespeare, to a single individual, and that not a woman, but a man.

The second edition of Shakespeare's sonnets appeared in 1640; it possesses no title to authority, but it is significant that a new arrangement was already deemed necessary, though only thirty-one years had elapsed since the issue of the *editio princeps*. As no single clue will lead us through the confusion of the sonnets in the edition of 1609, the query naturally arises whether Shakespeare did not originally design to compose a series in the manner of his contemporaries. This suspicion is confirmed by the observation that certain smaller groups, containing from two to nine sonnets each, are easily made out in the general body of Shakespeare's collection, as has already been done by Delius in his edition of 1864.

Stengel admits that the order proposed by himself is open to criticism, but is convinced that the sonnets somehow compose a series. He assumes that the twenty-sixth sonnet is to be regarded as the dedication, and that the Earl of Southampton is at once Shakespeare's patron and the friend who is repeatedly addressed. Accordingly, these compositions would belong to a date intermediate between those of the *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, that is, soon after 1592, in which year Daniel's sonnets were given to the world. The proposed arrangement is as follows, though without the analyses which the author has subjoined to the numbers. The series includes only sonnets 1 to 126. No. 26 is the dedicatory sonnet, as above stated, and the order of the others is 1, 4, 8, 7, 11, 3, 5, 6, 2, 9, 10, 12, 20, 14, 13, 15, 16, 17, 59, 106, 53, 105, 54, 104, 81, 55, 64, 19, 63, 65, 60, 107, 18, 126, 108, 77, 122, 100, 101, 38, 23, 73, 74, 32, 39, 78, 79, 82, 21, 76, 103, 83, 85, 80, 86, 71, 72, 102, 84,

58, 57, 67, 68, 123, 66, 116, 115, 124, 25, 29, 30, 31, 37, 125, 91, 92, 93, 94, 69, 70, 33, 34, 35, 95, 96, 40, 41, 42, 36, 87, 50, 51, 27, 28, 43, 61, 62, 22, 24, 46, 47, 44, 45, 97, 98, 99, 48, 49, 88, 89, 90, 109, 117, 110, 121, 111, 112, 75, 52, 113, 114, 118, 119, 120, 56.

The second appendix contains Barnfield's sonnets, reprinted from the first edition of 1595. As Grosart printed only fifty copies of a new edition, Stengel has laid students and lovers of English literature under an obligation by this reprint. The spelling Grossart occurs four times instead of Grosart. Unfortunately it must be said that the pages of this journal are frequently disfigured by annoying blunders, not a few of which must be due to the ignorance or carelessness of authors, since by no stretch of ingenuity can the type-setters be made responsible for all.

R. Boyle contributes a scholarly paper on Shakespeare and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. He believes Fletcher to have written the following portions, namely, all of the Second Act, Scenes 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Third Act, Scenes 1 and 2 of the Fourth Act, and Scenes 1 and 2 of the Fifth Act, with the exception of the first 18 lines of V 1.

Regarding the authorship of the remaining portion, the author thus sums up the results of his investigation: "The metrical style of our drama will not enable us to decide between Shakespeare, Massinger, and Beaumont, and in no way militates against the assumption that a third dramatist was engaged upon it. Shakespeare could not have been a collaborator, since the characters do not unfold themselves in his manner through a process of natural growth, nor do they exhibit any marked individuality. The metrical style points rather to Massinger than to Beaumont. The whole spirit of the play, but especially the political allusions, belong to a later period than that of Beaumont's activity. The women are such as Massinger was accustomed to draw, and no longer what they were in Beaumont's time. The transports of admiration with which the heroes are overwhelmed by the other characters are a trait peculiar to Massinger. The mad scenes resemble those of Massinger in *A Very Woman*. The numerous imitations of Shakespeare, while they forbid us to ascribe the play to him, are quite in the manner of Massinger. The number of classical allusions is another confirmation of the theory. Finally, the rhythm of the more elevated passages may be as confidently attributed to Massinger as to Shakespeare."

Boyle includes Mr. Fleay and Mr. Furnivall in a polemic directed against Mr. Hickson, the originator of the theory that the drama is the joint production of Shakespeare and Fletcher. He admits that the case is not closed, but expects that closer study of Massinger will remove all doubts.

W. Sattler, *Zur Englischen Grammatik*, IV. This article discusses the use of *no* and *not* before comparatives, and quotes a multitude of examples from Shakespeare, Addison, Johnson, Goldsmith, Jane Austen, Macaulay and various modern writers, but arrives at no result commensurate with the labor expended.

F. H. Stratmann offers several emendations of Middle English authors. The works in question are *Sainte Marherete*, *pe liflade of St. Juliana*, *Hali Maidenhad*, *Early English poems and lives of Saints VIII*, *Lazamon*, *The Story of Genesis and Exodus*, *Old English Miscellany*, and *William of Palerne*.

This is followed by a few notes on Middle English Phonology, containing examples of *a* for *e*, *o* for *eo*, and *a* for *ea*.

G. Wendt considers The Treatment of English Prepositions in the Real-schule of the first class. He advocates greater thoroughness in the teaching of English, and offers his paper as a specimen of the work done by himself in upper *secunda*. Professing to follow Mätzner, he illustrates various uses of the prepositions *of*, *off*, *in*, and *at* by a good selection of examples, obtained at first hand from English books.

The Book Notices begin with a review of Vol. II of The Folk-Lore Record, by Felix Liebrecht. Heyne's fourth edition of Beowulf is noticed by Oscar Brenner, who proposes an edition in uniform orthography. The second edition of Earle's Book for the beginner in Anglo-Saxon is appropriately condemned by Brenner. A short criticism by K. Maurer of my extracts from the Anglo-Saxon Laws closes this department.

Criticisms of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache occupy pp. 142-79.

The Programmschau touches upon nothing of special interest. The department of Miscellanea has an extended obituary notice of Wilhelm Wagner, accompanied by a bibliography of his works. The Zeitschriftenschau has full or partial tables of contents of the following periodicals: Anglia, Bd. III, Heft 3; Herrig's Archiv, Bd. LXIII, Heft 3 und 4; and The American Journal of Philology, Vol. I, No. 1.

II.—The number begins with an elaborate study by M. Kaluža, entitled The Middle English Poem, William of Palerne, and its French source. The French romance, Guillaume de Palerne, was composed about the end of the 12th century; this was done into English by a minstrel, named William, somewhere near the year 1350. The English poem, which exists in a MS of King's College Library, Cambridge, has been twice published, by Madden for the Roxburghe Club, London, 1832, and by Skeat for the E. E. T. S., London, 1867. No one has yet undertaken a detailed comparison of the original and the English version, though ten Brink's statements in his Geschichte der englischen Literatur, p. 419 et seq., are in the main to be depended upon. The scope of his investigation is indicated by the author at the outset. He undertakes to determine the points of view from which we are to explain the deviations of the paraphrase from its original. These comprise such differences as those of language, metre, and audience, account being also made of such changes as flow from design or poetic idiosyncrasy.

The slighter variations, dependent upon the difference of language and metre, are first illustrated by examples; the author then proceeds to examine the more important modifications, under the heads of manner and matter respectively. The former includes such changes as are made in the interest of a more logical sequence, for the purpose of supplying a missing *motif*, or in general for the sake of clearness, together with such as arise from adding picturesque details and from occasional transposition.

Under the latter rubric are classed the omission of unimportant or unintelligible portions, and the abridgment of passages descriptive of festivities,

costumes, battles, the sentiment of love, etc. To compensate his hearers for these losses, the paraphrast has dwelt lovingly on most of the episodes, on descriptions of natural scenery, on the pleasures of the table, and the portrayal of individual characters. The scheme thus laid down is carried through with great circumstantiality, until we are at last confronted with the query whether these variations are to be attributed to the English translation or belong to an intermediate French version which is no longer in existence. This question is unhesitatingly and conclusively answered by attributing the changes to the translator. In conclusion, after adducing the opinion of ten Brink, with whom the writer is in substantial accord, he adds: "He (*i. e.* William the Minstrel) is a clever narrator, who has made a happy choice of alliterative verse, has retained the fable of the poem unchanged, while yet exhibiting considerable originality in the handling of individual scenes; and, what is of greater consequence, has known how to adapt the poem to the taste and spiritual horizon of his countrymen, and thus to acquit himself of the self-imposed task as well as his circumstances, and the century in which he lived, would permit." An appendix contains emendations of Michelant's *Guillaume de Palerne* and Skeat's *William of Palerne*.

Hermann Fischer, *Zur Geschichte der Aussprache des Englischen*. This is a short notice of Georg Rudolf Weckherlin's 'Triumphall Shevvs set forth lately at Stuttgart: written first in German, and now in English,' and printed at Stuttgart in 1616.

F. H. Stratmann, *Zur Mittelenglischen Grammatik*. A brief note upon neuter *a*-stems which take a paragoric *e* in Middle English.

R. Thum continues, as the second part of a program printed in 1879, a series of Notes on Macaulay's History. The method adopted is a commendable one, and likely to prove useful to the advanced students for whom the notes are designed. Macaulay's writings are laid under contribution to furnish illustrations of the particular word or phrase which the annotator selects for comment. The following may serve as an example: "*improvement*. Das grosse Wort der Engländer, insbesondere der Liberals, 1. 97; they are always pressing forward, disposed to think lightly of the risks and inconveniences which attend improvement, and disposed to give every change credit for being an improvement." So under *moral improvement* the writer remarks: "In order to understand the English word 'moral,' or indeed the English conception of life, we must not forget that the English, since they have always been freer in a political sense, are accustomed to consider themselves under stricter obligations to morality than is the case with continental peoples, and that morality plays much the same rôle in English society as honor formerly did in knightly circles."

In the Book Notices, Alfred Stern's *Milton and his Times* is reviewed by J. Caro. This is followed by shorter notices of Schaffner's *Lord Byron's Cain* and its sources, Katterfeld's *Roger Ascham, his Life and Works*, Koch's *Select Minor Poems of Chaucer* (translation), Bennewitz's *Chaucer's Sir Thopas*, Klint's *Account of Chaucer's translation of the Romaunt of the Rose*, which is pronounced worthless by Lindner, and Herford's and Widgery's *Essays on the First Quarto Edition of Hamlet*. *Modern American Lyrics*, a volume of 308

pp., edited by Karl Knortz and Otto Dickman, is welcomed with enthusiasm by David Asher.

There is the usual list of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die Englische Sprache, and one of University Lectures on English Philology. These are followed by reports on Herrig's Archiv, Bd LXVI, Hest 1 und 2; Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, 1880, Nos. 7-12; Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1 Jahrgang; and The American Journal of Philology, Vol I, Nos. 2 and 3.

III.—Dryden's Theory of the Drama is the title of a paper by F. Bobertag. It consists of little more than an analysis of Dryden's Essay of Dramatick Poesy and of the preface to his Troilus and Cressida. The chief reason for undertaking an exposition of the poet's views is stated to lie in the fact "that Dryden is one of the first modern poets in whose work there is any manifestation of theory as existing in and for itself,—as an independent power, so to speak."

R. Thum continues his Notes on Macaulay's History. These notes, though written for Germans, contain material, at least, which might be useful to analytical students of English anywhere.

The Question of the English Essay in *Realprima* is ably handled by W. Münch. Recognizing the inability of the teacher to familiarize his class sufficiently with English idiom to insure a masterly use of English, he concludes that the essay to which the scholar should devote himself with all his might is the German essay. The assignment of this to the chief place should not, in his opinion, be accounted a grievance by any department, by that of modern languages as little as any other.

The Book Notices contain reviews of Körner's Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen, Grein's Kurzgefasste angelsächsische Grammatik, the new edition of Müller's Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache, Würzner's Ueber Chaucer's lyrische Gedichte, Doehn's Aus dem amerikanischen Dichterwald, McCarthy's History of our own Times, and Wülcker's Altenglisches Lesebuch.

Brenner's review of Grein's Grammatik is noteworthy as containing a catalogue of Old English Glosses. The most readable of these articles is Hopp's notice of Doehn's Sketches of American Poets, which contains more than one striking and just observation. The criticism of Wülcker's Reader extends over 33 pages, and concludes as follows: "Whether the author finds all my strictures justifiable and all my emendations and explanations acceptable or not, I hope at least to have convinced him that the first part in particular requires thorough revision before it can be presented to our fellow-workers in America."

The Literary Notices call attention to Schmitz's Encyklopädie des philologischen Studiums der neueren Sprachen, a new edition of Mätzner's Englische Grammatik, and Heyne's Uebungsstücke zur Laut- und Flexionslehre der altgermanischen Dialecte.

The Reviews of text-books and the Miscellanea are omitted by the editor for lack of space.

ALBERT S. COOK.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. XXXVII  
Hand. 1883.

I Heft.

D. H. Müller offers contributions to South-Arabian epigraphy, in the form of criticisms of the *Études sur l'Épigraphie de Yemen* of Joseph and Hartwig Derenbourg (*Journ. Asiat.*, Avril-Mai-Juin, 1882), and of H. Derenbourg's article on Himyaritic proper names (*Revue des Études Juives*, 1880, p. 56). The inscription Hal. 349, which Halévy makes a curiously irregular boustrophedon of 13 lines, and Derenbourg a regular one of 7 lines, he rearranges into 4 boustrophedon lines, without, however, bringing out a very clear sense. Inscript. Hal. 174, he refers טכנן to טכנן, from the stem טכ (טכ), and renders "amelioration." He agrees with Derenbourg that הִל is sometimes not a preposition ("after"), but a substantive, = "province," but maintains that, when it has this latter sense, it does not form an external plural, and therefore הִלִּים cannot be taken as substantive. Derenbourg makes much of the Inscript. Osiand. 35 ("Ilšarh Yaḥḍib and Ya'zil Bayyin, kings of Saba and Raidan, sons of Fari, Yanhab, king of Saba"), as showing that Fari was the last king of the second period, just preceding the division of the kingdom, which was occasioned by the campaign of Aelius Gallus; Müller points out that he had already drawn this conclusion from the inscription (in his *Burgen*, II 44), only with the doubtfulness which the absence of further material makes proper.

The article of Hartwig Derenbourg above-mentioned attempts to show, from a comparison between Sabeian and biblical proper names, that the Sabeians borrowed from the Jews (who were numerous and influential in southern Arabia B. C. 200-525) not only many proper names, but also the north Semitic principle (unknown to the south Semitic dialects) of forming compound proper names. To this view Müller objects that some of D.'s Sabeian names are misread, and some of his biblical names not Hebrew, but Edomite or Aramaic; that in a corrected list of corresponding names the laws of phonetic interchange between the two languages are strictly observed, which would hardly be the case if one people had borrowed from the other; and that, so far from its being true that compound proper names are unknown to the south Semitic tongues, they abound in Arabic and Ethiopic. The last objection is well taken, and we cannot well suppose that the Sabeians borrowed the principle of forming compound names. Whether they borrowed individual names from the Jews (a thing in itself not unlikely) must be determined from a wider study of the inscriptions. Müller remarks that the agreement in names in the two languages is to be explained from the elements of the primitive Semitic speech inherited by both, but that there is no ground to suppose that very early (prehistoric or historic) intercourse has brought Hebrew nearer to south Arabic than to north Arabic. The first part of this statement is altogether probable; the second part opens a question which can be answered only by more ancient documents than have yet been found among the inscriptions of Saba.

In the *Zeitschrift* of 1878 E. Nestle published a linguistic treatise of Jacob of Edessa, and in connection with it addressed two questions to the classical philologists. The first was: from what Greek word did Jacob take his Syriac term, which means literally "preparation of the word," and, from the connection, must signify "derivation"? To this Professor G. Hoffmann, of Kie



answered immediately that it was *ἐτυμολογία*, which Jacob understood and translated as *ἐτοιμολογία*. The other question relates to Jacob's etymology of the Greek *θεός*, which he says comes "from running, or from seeing, or from burning." The "running" and "seeing" Nestle connected with *θεῖν* and *θεᾶσθαι*, but could get no appropriate word for "burning." He has now found this in a Greek poem by Johannes Euchaitorum Metropolita (edition of (Studemund-) Bollig-Lagarde, 1882, p. ix), which reads: *θεὸς . . . δοκεῖ θεῖν . . . θεᾶται τὴν κτίσιν . . . αἶθει τε πᾶν ῥύπασμα*. It is still, however, not clear whence Jacob and the bishop John got these etymologies.<sup>1</sup>

Other articles in this number are: Die Einleitung des Mahābhāshya, übersetzt von O. A. Danielsson. Das altindische Ākhyāna, mit besondrer Rücksicht auf das Suparṇākhyāna, von H. Oldenberg. Beiträge zur Erklärung der Aśoka-Inschriften, von G. Bühler. Lösung eines Räthsels im Veda, von R. Roth. Šāh Tahmāsp I und seine Denkwürdigkeiten, von F. Teufel.

Book notices: Tomaschek's Centralasiatische Studien, by Wilhelm Geiger. Hillebrandt's Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, by B. Lindner. Bartholomae's Arische Forschungen, by the same. Dieterici's Theologie des Aristoteles (Arabic translation of some unknown, probably Neo-Platonic Greek work, ascribed by the Arabs to Aristotle), by W. Ahlwardt. Robinson's Persian Poetry, by W. Bacher.

This number contains also part of the annual bibliographical report or review of the literature: Malay-Polynesian, by H. Kern. Abesinian, by F. Praetorius. Syriac (including Mandaean, the Sinaitic inscriptions, etc.), by F. Baethgen; and Sanskrit, by J. Klatt.

## II Heft.

In continuation of his former papers (see Vol. 36 of the Zeitschrift), A. Socin communicates a number of proverbial and other expressions in the Arabic dialect of Mōṣul and Mārdīn. They are given in Roman transcription as they were taken down from the mouths of the natives, and also in Arabic characters. In some cases Socin has found a phrase written in Arabic, and he then allows this written form to stand alongside of his transcription, though the two may differ somewhat.

David Kaufmann, of Budapest, gives a study of the curious medieval scientific (philosophical-religious) Hebrew, in the form of remarks on Ibn Tibbon's translation of Saadia's Introduction to his Kitāb al-amānāt wa al-i'tikādāt (Hebrew, Sefer ha. emūnōth wa. ha. dē'ōth), "Treatise on the articles of faith." Jehuda ben Shaul, called Ibn Tibbon, is the first-known and best-known of the host of translators who, from the 12th century on (perhaps earlier), occupied themselves with turning Arabic-written books into Hebrew, and his translation of Saadia's important work is a mine of information respecting the language and theology of his time. Kaufmann, confining himself to the Introduction,

<sup>1</sup> Plat. Cratyl. 397 D: ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς φύσεως τῆς τοῦ θεῖν θεοὺς αὐτοὺς ὀνομάσαι (φαίνονται). Macrobius, 1, 23: θεοὺς enim dicunt sidera et stellas ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν id est τρέχειν quod semper in cursu sint ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεωρεῖσθαι. With the derivation of θεός from αἶθω compare Posidonius' derivation of δαίμων, ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου id est καιμένου. Macrobius, l. c. B. L. G.



corrects the Hebrew text with the aid of two MSS, and compares the translation with the Arabic original. His opinion of Ibn Tibbon is, on the whole, favorable—he thinks him no pedant or forcer of language, but a generally faithful, though often paraphrastic and unintelligent, translator.

Other articles: *Bābur und Abū'l-faẓl*, by F. Teufel. *Die Seelen des Mittelreichs im Parsismus*, by R. Roth. *Zur Erklärung des Avesta*, by C. de Harlez. *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Asoka-Inschriften*, by G. Bühler. W. Bacher makes an addendum to his article on Abulwalid, *Zeitschrift* 36, 406. Julius Jolly writes from Benares of the establishment of a Manuscript library in that city. Professor Wm. Wright, of Cambridge, England, asks for information concerning manuscripts of the following works, editions of which he is preparing: the *Nakā'id* of Garīr and al-Farazdak, the *Dīwān* of Garīr, and the *Dīwān* of al-Aḥṭal.

There is a favorable notice of Max Müller's "Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature," by Ernst Leumann; and Chr. Bartholomae has a remark on F. Ch. Andreas's "The book of the Mainyo-i-Khard."

The report on Sanskrit for the preceding year, by J. Klatt, is finished, and E. Kautzsch furnishes the report on Hebrew, Old Testament exegesis, biblical theology, and the history of Israel.

C. H. Toy.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. 8th series, Tome I. 1883.

Février-Mars,

Charles Clermont-Ganneau communicates a number of seals, Israelite, Phenician, and Syrian, together with several unedited Phenician inscriptions, and two Cypriote Intaglios—a preliminary account of a large collection he has been making for many years, a full discussion of which he announces his intention of publishing. The seals contain a simple name, or the name with patronymic or name of husband, or the name with or without such addition preceded by the Lamed of ownership, or the name followed by the word קנר, "servant" (that is, the client of a great personage), or the name preceded by חתם, "seal" (this formula, according to the author, is especially Aramean-Persian), or the name preceded by לזכר, "in memory of" (probably Israelitish), and sometimes, though rarely, the indication of the use to which the gem was put. Clermont-Ganneau discusses the engraved words briefly, and calls attention to the forms of the letters. Among the noteworthy terms are the apparently divine names Koh or Kohbin (No. 20) and Molokram (No. 34); the latter is formed like Abram, the former is obscure. Among the inscriptions are two (29, 30) which seem to be Greek. The legends furnish no historical material.

The inscriptions recently discovered at Palmyra by Prince Abamelek Lararew are explained by de Vogüé (his communication was made to the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Nov. 3, 1882). The most important of these is a bilingual (Aramaic-Greek) of the 8 Nisan, 448 of the Seleucidan era (A. D. April 8, 137), containing a decree of the Palmyrene Senate, fixing the law respecting the taxes on imported merchandise and slaves. It is engraved on

a stone about two metres high by five long, and is divided into four panels, of which the first contains a bilingual text, the second an Aramaic text in three columns, and the third and fourth a Greek text in three columns. The Greek part of the bilingual had already been published, and the Aramean was so little injured that de Vogüé is able to give an almost complete translation, and to correct by it the published Greek text. The Aramaic of the second panel has suffered greatly, and Prince Abamelek, at considerable cost of money and trouble, engaged a photographer to go to Palmyra and make an exact copy of the inscription, which de Vogüé received in time to correct the Aramaic of the first panel, and from which he hopes to make a better translation of that of the second. This inscription is, by its length and distinctness, of great palaeographical importance; it fixes the Palmyrene alphabet of the second century A. D., and thus furnishes a standard by which to fix the date of other ancient Aramean monuments.

Ernest Renan discusses two epigraphic monuments from Edessa, one a bust and inscription, sent him by Salomon Reinach, member of the French School of Athens, the other a mosaic of three human figures with inscription, communicated to him by Clermont-Ganneau. In the second of these the letters are so much blurred that Renan can make nothing of it; his interpretation of the second, in which he formerly saw an allusion to the letter of Christ to Abgarus (*Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, Nov. 10, 1882), has been modified by a better reading published by Sachau, *ZDMG*, 1882, p. 158, though he still retains his opinion that it is probably Christian (of the 4th or 5th century), against Sachau, who apparently holds it to be pagan.

Other articles are: *Fragment d'un commentaire sur le Vendîdād* (continued), by J. Darmesteter. *L'Inscription sanscrite de Han Chey*, by A. Barth. *Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi*, by Senart.

Stanislas Guyard has a note on the Van-inscriptions, and J. Darmesteter one on the connection in Iranian literature between the moon and thought. There is a notice of the recently published works of A. de Longpérier, by E. Babelon; a notice of the Report of the French North-African Commission (appointed to gather Arabic and Berber material), by B. de Meynard; and an account of a curious Persian text, by L. Chodzkievicz.

#### Avril-Mai-Juin.

Marcel Devic describes an unedited translation of the Kurān, by the Franciscan Dominicus Germanus, of Silesia, now preserved in the library of the College of Medicine at Montpellier. Germanus lived many years as missionary in the East, chiefly at Ispahan, acquired a fair knowledge of Arabic, and on his return to Europe, went to Spain, where, in the library of the Escorial, he produced his Kurān-translation somewhere between 1650 and 1665. This was before the fire of 1671, which destroyed a vast number of oriental manuscripts, and Germanus had access to all the exegetical riches of the Escorial. Devic thinks that his translation compares not unfavorably with that of Maracci, which it preceded by about thirty years; he gives no specimens. By way of introduction, Devic gives a brief history of the Christian polemical works against Muhammedanism and the Kurān up to the seventeenth century, and a

detailed account of the first translation of the Kurān, which, though not printed till 1543 by Theodore Buchmann (Bibliander), was made in 1143, at the instance of Peter, Abbot of Cluny, by the joint labors of the Englishman Robert Retensis, the Dalmatian Hermann, and two others; it was a somewhat rude production, but remained for several centuries the arsenal whence the Christians got their anti-Muhammedan weapons.

Other articles: Notes de lexicographie berbère, by René Basset. Études bouddhiques, comment on devient Arhati, by Léon Feer. Quelques notions sur les inscriptions en vieux khmer, by Aymonier. Additional note by Clermont-Ganneau to his article in the preceding number on Semitic seals.

De Goeje communicates a notice of Landberg's Proverbes et dictons de la province de Syrie, and B. de Meynard a letter from Basset describing his recent journey in the Berber territory. There is a tribute (read in a meeting of the Société Asiatique, May 11, 1883) to the late Professor Reinhart Dozy, of Leiden, and one (in Tamul) to the late A. G. Burnell, by Julien Vinson.

Juillet.

The July number contains the Annual Report, read by James Darmesteter, July 6, 1883.

C. H. Toy.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18 Jahrh. in Neudrucken, herausgeg. von BERNHARD SEUFFERT. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1883.

7, 8. Frankfurter Gelehrte Anzeigen vom Jahr 1772. As we learn from the introduction, the principal reason why a reprint of the "Anzeigen" of 1772 has found a place in this series, is evidently the fact that Goethe wrote several critical articles for the Frankfurt journal during that year. If not for other considerations, in this respect alone the collection would be interesting. Apart from certain reviews which undoubtedly were written by Goethe, and are generally published in the collections of his works, the question what *else* he contributed has not yet been decided with absolute certainty. The critical investigator will be amply rewarded, we hope, for his zeal in determining what Goethe must or may have written, and what *a priori* cannot by any means have come from his pen. If we wish to understand the character and influence of the "Anzeigen" of 1772, we must remember that the so-called "Sturm und Drang Periode" had then begun to amaze and revolutionize the literary world of Germany, a movement for which it had been prepared through Lessing's masterly productions. It will be sufficient here to refer merely to Goethe's "Goetz von Berlichingen," the first version of which was written in November of 1771, and to Gerstenberg's fantastic tragedy "Ugolino," which appeared in 1768. Although these two works are very different in regard to poetic merit, yet both of them bear witness to the character of the literary movement of the time.

Among the contributors to the "Anzeigen" of 1772, the only famous author, beside Goethe, was Herder, while there were many men of talent and local reputation who wrote more or less for the journal, but are scarcely known at present. In a preliminary notice of the first number, dated Jan. 3, 1772, the

editors announce that special attention shall be paid to the works of English authors. In fact the first article reviewed is entitled "Brittisches Museum oder Beyträge zur angenehmen Lektüre, aus dem Englischen," etc. In this volume are two articles on German character, and the English writer mentions some distinctive features of the German race which can be seen even at the present day, as, for instance, their thoroughness in literary works, and the fact that the Germans, among all foreign nations, make the best citizens in the countries which they choose for their second home. It is a little doubtful if the following remark of the same author holds good as applied to the present time: "Die Deutschen sind eine Art von Sterblichen, die vor allen mit der Mässigung begabt ist, sich bey jedem nur erträglichen Religions und Staatssystem zu beruhigen."

As a specimen of some of the rather *short* reviews contained in the "Anzeigen" the following may be mentioned. The book in question contains a description of travels through Russia by an English physician. The reviewer says: "Ein elendes Buch von einem unwissenden Medicus und kurzsichtigen Beobachter. Hierzu kommt noch die vollkommenste Unwissenheit in der Landessprache und diese . . . erzeugt die lächerlichste Nachricht."

The journal was established in 1736 and ended its career in 1790. With the year 1773 it began to decline rapidly; the editor of 1773, Bahrtdt, praised his friends and censured his enemies without any sense of justice. There was no longer the same free and independent spirit as in 1772; it is evident that a mutual admiration society wielded the sceptre to the exclusion of all true criticism.

9. Karl von Burgund, ein Trauerspiel (nach Aeschylus), von J. J. Bodmer. Although Bodmer had no poetic genius, his endeavors to bring about a new era in German literature must always be thankfully remembered. He deserves great credit for denouncing the slavish imitation of French models, and for recommending to his countrymen the works of English authors, especially those of Milton, as examples of true literary merit. He knew at least—what Gottsched did *not* know—that the power of imagination was an important element in the composition of poetic works. Bodmer's literary productions are now nearly forgotten; the work which was best known at the time is an epic poem entitled "Die Noachide," the subject of which is the Deluge.

The tragedy "Karl von Burgund" appeared in the "Schweizer Journal," of 1771, a short-lived and obscure publication. Bodmer's work is entitled to receive some attention, especially as Aeschylus might claim the tragedy as well as Bodmer. It is not so much a close imitation of "The Persians" as a translation. Many passages might be given to prove this fact; we may here mention only one: Pers. V 10, *κακόμαντις ἄγαν ὀρσολοπεῖται θυμὸς ἔσωθεν* = Karl, p. 5, Mein Herz pocht inwendig . . . und weissaget Unglück.

The names and scenes are changed. Xerxes is Karl, the deeds of the Greek heroes are transferred to the warlike exploits of the Swiss freemen against the Burgundians, Athens is Bern, Salamis becomes Murten. Bodmer's translation is prosaic, both in spirit and in form; yet there are a few passages which are not devoid of poetic beauty.

10. Versuch einiger Gedichte von F. v. Hagedorn. Friedrich von Hagedorn was born in 1708. The present work, dated 1729, contains his earliest poems,

when he was only 21 years old. No critic could judge them more severely than he did himself in later years. In 1745 he wrote to a friend that he would have liked to purchase every copy of the book and destroy it. Yet the work as it is betrays, to a great extent, the latent talent of the genuine bard, who afterwards distinguished himself by his lyric and didactic poems. The tendency to imitate French models is evident, while, on the other hand, the influence of Horace can be distinctly seen in this first attempt. Some of the poems contained in this collection appeared later in a greatly modified form. Hagedorn is still well known, especially by his little fable, "Ein verhängt Hühnchen fand einen feinen Diamant," and by the song, "Der Nachtigall reisende Lieder ertönen und locken schon wieder."

11. *Der Messias*. Erster, zweiter, und dritter Gesang, von F. G. Klopstock. When Klopstock left the old and famous school of Pforta, in September of 1745, the first plan of his "Messias" was nearly finished. He was then 21 years old; the idea of giving to the world a Christian epic had occupied his mind long before that time, and was greatly strengthened by the influence of Milton's "Paradise Lost." In the winter semester of 1745-46, at Jena, he began to write down the first three cantos of the "Messias" in poetic prose, which, in the summer of 1746, was changed to the form of the classic hexameter. These three cantos appeared first in 1748 in "Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen

Witzes. Vierter Band, viertes und fünftes Stück. Bremen. The editors of the journal, although very friendly towards the poet, were reluctant to publish the manuscript, since not only the manner and form in which it was treated, seemed to them too much boldness. Their hesitation was finally overcome by the enthusiastic approval of the work. As to the subject, there are reports of their sublimity were calculated to disturb the tranquility of a certain character. We may mention in this connection the words of Jena, beginning on the 13th line of the first poem: *Hamme! mein Haupt sei, Meine Hand in die Wolken, mein selbst, Der ich Gott bin, wie du: Ich will die Menschen vernichten*, attempts to introduce the form of the hexameter before the time of Klopstock, but nothing remarkable about it. Thus in a certain sense Klopstock had to create his own, although at times not successful, form on metric point of view.

To conceive of the enthusiastic reception with which the "Messias" were greeted by the literary world and the general. The continuation of the poem was expected with the greatest interest. The great disappointment of Klopstock's friends, the two were not finished before 1751. Then the work stopped. In 1753 the first two cantos appeared together, but the completion before 1755. Thus, between the publication of the first and second parts, twelve years had elapsed. There is no interval between the appearance of the earlier portions of the poem and the last part, which has the interest in the fact that there were other reasons that brought about this result, a fact acknowledged in the whole field of German literature.

at the time when the conclusion of the *Messias* appeared. The strife between Gottsched and Bodmer had ceased and was wellnigh forgotten; Lessing and Herder were the victorious champions on the new battleground, and the movement of the "Storm and Stress" had begun. The times were changed, but Klopstock's poetry had remained the same, or rather, apart from technical improvements, the last portions of the *Messias* were in spirit and in conception inferior to the beginning of the poem. The reading of the first three cantos can be recommended to all lovers of epic literature; moreover, they are interesting from more than one point of view.

12. *Vier Kritische Gedichte*, von J. J. Bodmer. 13. *Die Kindermörderin. Ein Trauerspiel*, von H. L. Wagner. 14. *Ephemerides und Volkslieder*, von Goethe. 15. *Gustav Wasa*, von C. Brentano. Each of these four volumes requires but a brief notice. No. 12 contains four poems of Bodmer. The first of them, "Character der Teutschen Gedichte," is the best and most important, as Bodmer gives here a well-drawn picture of German literature from its beginning to his own time, and a particularly good account of the poets of the 17th century. The second poem, "Die Drollingerische Muse," can be called a continuation of the first; both were written during the earlier part of Bodmer's life, and show him to his best advantage. The third poem, "Untergang der berühmten Namen," and the fourth, "Bodmer nicht verkannt," were composed during his last years, and betray the envy of the man who felt that his glory was gone and that greater minds had arisen on the literary horizon.

No. 13 is very interesting in so far as it furnishes material for comparison with Schiller's "Kabale und Liebe," and with Margarethe in Goethe's "Faust." The work appeared anonymously in 1776. In regard to its form as well as to its contents it is a good specimen of some of the productions by which the so-called Storm and Stress period was characterized; it is strong, rude, and realistic.

Anything that emanated from Goethe is always welcome; therefore No. 14 of this series will find many readers. Among the popular songs given in this collection there are some which are very famous, even at the present day, and others that are but too well known.

At first sight the reading of No. 15 by any one unacquainted with the real idea of the author, will produce a kind of mental condition similar to that which the commentators of Goethe enjoyed when they tried to explain the "Hexeneinmaleins" in *Faust*. After studying the introduction to the work, by Professor Minor, of Prague, the meaning and purpose of Brentano become sufficiently clear. We have no space here to enter into details, and, moreover, the charm of novelty must not be destroyed. Yet among the so-called personages of the play we may mention the following: Kotzebue's ass, a lamp, a cat, the mayor of Lübeck, an officer in convulsions, a mathematical point, centaurs, an atheist, a librarian, the works of Ovid, Tertullian, etc.

D.

---

#### ROMANIA. No. 39.

M. A. Thomas has found in the Vatican a number of documents which are of some importance for the literary history of the 14th century. A papal bull dated July 11th, 1295, gives some interesting information concerning Jauffré

detailed as  
till 1522 by the  
of Peter, Abbot  
ensis, the  
production  
tians got

Other  
boudoir  
sur le  
mont

De  
provin  
recent  
of the  
Lein

Jui  
The  
July

Don

7

int

has

ent

con

fr

ge

co

in

Ge

ho

of

De

o

n

“

of

n

yet

t

,

:

in

the author of the treatise on  
whom we owe three lyric pieces,  
a papal bull of Aug. 19th, 1295,  
Gachetto Gattilusio undertook in  
part. Four bulls issued between  
the author of *Voir dit*, Guillaume  
ments that the latter is not identical,  
other scholars, with Guillaume de  
noelain of the king.

French words in which light vowels  
are affected by the neighborhood of

(Continued.)

collection of popular Norman songs,  
would have added to their scientific  
original dialectic form, which has  
only.

should have given in Ital. *noce*,  
*noce*, *noce*, *noce*, which forms  
an analogy with *noce* and its deriva-  
tion, hence the word *noce* common  
in *noce* being called *noce*, Span. *noce*,  
noce.

The O. F. particle *gier*, *gier* : *igier*

noce.

noce.

noce.

noce is not, as has been supposed  
an assimilation of *l* > *n* in *l'on* > *non*

noce to Spanish etymology. He treats  
noce; the latter he takes from

noce política y literaria de los Trova-  
noce which he claims to have seen himself,  
noce to the troubadours, who had  
noce that Meyer ingeniously points out that  
noce to a curious misunderstanding of  
noce and besunders Alphonse X (1252-84)  
noce and Toulouse verschwunden waren,  
noce gewährte."

noce of French MSS.

noce.

noce by G. Paris of Hofmann  
noce an extensive and not very favorable  
noce by A. Darmstadter.

No. 40.

Gaston Paris, *Études sur les romans de la table ronde*. M. Paris promises to bring out, at a later date, what we expect to be a most interesting essay on this very difficult subject; in the meantime he satisfies our curiosity by an exposition of his general theories concerning the various works in poetry and prose relating to the legend of the round table. The Breton epics are the product of the contact of French society with the Celts. In the development of each legend we must distinguish three stages: its ancient Celtic form, its Anglo-Norman form, and lastly the French adaptation. All works relating to the round table must be divided into two classes: (a) "les romans biographiques." In these, some one member of the round table plays the principal part, the court of Arthur is hardly more than the point of departure, Arthur and his wife take a very subordinate position, they receive the hero at the beginning and crown him in the end. (b) The second class of works gives a more prominent position to Arthur and his wife; they present especially, in the relation of Lancelot to Guenièvre, a new conception of love; they add to the ancient Celtic elements of adventure, courtesy and love, that of religion and even of mysticism. To the first class belong Erec, Ivain, Lancelot, Yder, Durmart, Giglain, etc.; to the second, Saint Graal, Merlin, Arthur, Lancelot, *Queste du saint graal*, *Mort Arthur*. M. Paris then discusses the contents and the authorship of the German *Lanzelet* of Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, the French original of which is lost, and shows conclusively that the troubadour Arnaut Daniel cannot be the author, as has been supposed by Adelung, Raynouard and Fauriel. Neither in this poem, nor in any other of the period, mention is made of an unlawful love between *Lanzelet* and Guenièvre, whence M. Paris concludes that this part of the legend must belong to a later period and must have originated in France. It is to be hoped that M. Paris will soon give us the continuation of his most interesting article.

Alfred Morel-Fabio, *Mélanges de littérature catalane*. I. *L'amant, la femme et le confesseur*. Conte en vers du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Introduction, text and glossary. This little poem is taken from the same MS (library of Carpentras, No. 377) from which we have already Mussafia's *Catalanische metrische Version der sieben weisen Meister*, and Foerster's *En Buch et de son cheval*.

Gaston Raynaud, *Le ju de le capete Martinet* (Bibl. Nat. nouv. acq. franc. No. 1731). A poem of 553 lines, probably by Mahiu le Poirier, and written about A. D. 1300 by a Picard scribe.

Paul Meyer, *La farce des trois commères*. From a Turin MS (H. 3. 26). P. M. concludes that this little farce originated in Savoy.

E. Cosquin gives the last series of his collection of Lorraine tales.

Victor Smith gives Velay and Forez versions of two well-known French songs, "Renaud," and "La porcheronne."

The *Mélanges* contain various little contributions by Joret, Cornu, G. Paris, A. Thomas, and a *Fragment inédit des Tournois de Chauvenci* de Jacques Bretel, by P. Meyer. G. Paris reviews Weidner's *Prosaroman von Joseph von Arimathia*, and tries hard to say some pleasant words about L. Adam's work on the Lorraine dialects.

H. C. G. v. JAGEMANN.



Kreolische Studien. Nos. IV und V. Von HUGO SCHUCHARDT. Wien, 1883.

No. V of this interesting series is of no particular value philologically, though Dr. Schuchardt, its author, has extracted it as a *separatdruck* from the transactions of the Vienna Kais. Acad. der Wissenschaften. It treats of Melanesian English—that incredible compound of word-scrapa gathered, in one instance at least, from New Caledonian, Chinese, English and French words; *e. g.* *Tayas lookout belong faya* = Friends, look out for the fire! Of what earthly interest can such linguistic offal be, call it Creole or call it what you please, except to show off the monstrous doings in the South seas? 'Pidgin-Melanesian'—of which No. V treats—is the work of trepang-catchers, whale-men, sandalwood hunters, and missionaries; and a pretty mess it is. Dr. Schuchardt's usually clear and sure instinct deserts him when he adopts, as faithful reproductions of one of these *mestizo* lingos, such phonetically untrue specimens as the following: Capsize that big fellow pellate and give master small fellow pellate (empty the big plate and give your master a small one). 'Uncle Remus' could teach him far better,

treats of the contact of Philippine Island Spanish with the  
ve an instructive and interesting specimen of Schuchardt's  
is series, he defines to be preliminary to a larger work. In  
ish we have genuine native wit and ingenuity at work  
h centuries of contact and attrition, a dialect which has a  
ay, which is a growth, which is not the result of a fortuitous  
ng and unharmonized elements. Here we have working a  
d not the *σαλπίς* *τι* which Miltiades felt tempted to sus-  
of; linguistic problems of value have been wrought out by  
itals, and Dr. Schuchardt does a real service in collecting  
n.

J. A. H.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Cobbett (W.) The English grammar; by Alfred Ayres. *Appleton*. 16mo. \$1.00.

Knapp (W. I.) Modern French readings. *Ginn, Heath & Co.* 12mo. \$1.65.

### BRITISH.

Æschyli Fabulæ(IKETIΔΕΣ ΧΟΗΦΟΡΟΙ) in Libro Mediceo Mendose Scriptae ex VV. D.D. coniecturis emendatius editae cum Scholiis Graecis et brevi adnotatione critica, curante F. A. Paley. 8vo, 140 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 7s. 6d.

Brooks (W. H. S.) Vestiges of the Broken Plural in Hebrew. Royal 8vo, sd., 20 pp. Dublin, *Ponsonby*. *Simpkin*. 1s.

Brown (Robert). The Myth of Kirke, including the Visit of Odysseus to the Shades: An Homeric Study. 8vo. *Longmans*. 5s.

Cicero. De Natura Deorum. Libri Tres, with Introduction and Commentary by Joseph B. Mayor. Vol. 2, 8vo, 330 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 12s. 6d.

— Somnium Scipionis. Edited by W. D. Pearman. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 56 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s.

— De Finibus Libri Quinque. The Text Revised and Explained by J. S. Reid. 3 vols. Vol. 3 containing the Translation. 8vo, 186 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 8s.

Demosthenes' Oration against Meidias. Edited for Schools by C. A. M. Fennell. 12mo. *Hamilton*. 5s.

Dennis (George). The Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria. With Map, Plans, and Illustrations. 2 vols., 8vo, 1190 pp. *Murray*. 21s.

Euripides. Iphigenia among the Tauri. Edited, with Introduction and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by E. B. England. 12mo, 290 pp. *Macmillan*. 4s. 6d.

Fausboll (J.) The Jataka, together with its Commentary. Vol. 3, 8vo. *Trübner*. 28s.

Fergusson (James). The Temple of Diana at Ephesus, with special reference to Mr. Wood's Discoveries of its Remains. 4to. *Trübner*. 5s.

Grimm (J.) Teutonic Mythology. Translated from the 4th ed. by James Stephen Stallybrass. Vol. 3, 8vo, 406 pp. *Bell & Sons*. 15s.

Jaschke (H. A.) Tibetan Grammar. Cr. 8vo. *Trübner*. 5s.

Plautus. Trinummus. With Notes and Introduction by C. E. Freeman and Rev. A. Sloman. 12mo, 746 pp. *Frowde*. 3s.

Pope (Rev. G. N.) A Handbook of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language. In 3 parts. Part 2, 8vo. *W. H. Allen*. 12s. 6d.

Schliemann (Henry). Troja, Results of the Latest Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Homer's Troy and in the Heroic Tumuli and other Sites, made in the year 1882, and a Narrative of a Journey in the Troad in 1881. Preface by Prof. A. H. Sayce, with 150 woodcuts and 4 maps and plans. 8vo, 458 pp. *Murray*. 42s.

Thompson (F. E.) A Syntax of Attic Greek. Cr. 8vo, 467 pp. *Rivingtons*. 8s. 6d.

Virgil's Eclogues. English Version. By Samuel Palmer. With Illustrations by the author. Folio, 116 pp. *Seeley*. 21s.

— Æneid. Book 9. Edited, with English Notes, by A. Sidgwick. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 80 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 1s. 6d.

Wedderburn (A. D. O.), and Collingwood (W. G.) The Economist of Xenophon. Edited, with a Preface, by Professor Ruskin. 8vo. (Bibliotheca Pastorum.) Orpington, *Allen*. 7s. 6d.

Xenophon's Hiero. With Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, by the Rev. Hubert A. Holden. 12mo, 172 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

#### DANISH.

Ólsen (B. M.) Runerne i den oldislandske Literatur. Kjobenhavn, 1883. 8vo, 150 pp. 3m.

#### FRENCH.

Basset (René). Notes de lexicographie berbère. In-8. Extrait du Journal Asiatique. *Leroux*. 3 fr. 50.

Carrière (A.) Inscriptions d'un reliquaire arménien de la collection Basilewski. Avec 2 planches. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 5 fr.

Collection de contes et de chansons populaires. In-16. *Leroux*. Tomes VI. Contes indiens. Les Trente-deux récits du trône (Batris-Sinhasan), ou les Merveilleux exploits de Vikramaditya, traduits du bengali et augmentés d'une étude et d'un index par Léon Feer. 5 fr. Tome VII. Contes arabes. Histoire des dix vizirs (Bakhtiar-Nameh), traduite et annotée par René Basset. 5 fr.

Dutens (Alfred). Essai sur l'origine des exposants casuels en sanscrit. Gr. in-8. *Vieweg*. 6 fr.

Duval (Rubens). Les Dialectes néo-araméens de Salamos. In-8. *Vieweg*. 8 fr.

Ernault (Émile). Étude sur le dialecte breton de la presqu'île de Batz. In-8. (Saint-Brieuc.) *Vieweg*. 1 fr. 50.

Le Héricher (Ed.) Histoire et glossaire de deux préfixes dans les patois, le vieux français et le français. 2 édition. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr. 50.

Mélanges orientaux. Textes et traductions publiés par les professeurs de l'Ecole spéciale des langues orientales vivantes, à l'occasion du 6 congrès international des orientalistes, réuni à Leyde (septembre, 1883). Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 25 fr.

Miller (E.) Fragments inédits de littérature grecque. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 3 fr.

Nève (Félix). Les Époques littéraires de l'Inde; Études sur la poésie sanscrite. In-8. (Bruxelles.) *Leroux*. 9 fr.

Rosny (Léon de). Codex Cortesianus; manuscrit hiératique des anciens Indiens de l'Amérique centrale. In-4, avec 42 planches. *Maisonneuve*. Cart., 100 fr.

Schefer (Ch.) Chrestomathie persane. Tome I. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

Van Eys (W. J.) Le tutoiement basque. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 1 fr.

Vinson (Julien). Éléments de la grammaire générale hindoustani. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 5 fr.

Zotenberg. Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou. Texte éthiopien publié et traduit par H. Zotenberg. In-4. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

GERMAN.

Anton (J. R. W.) De origine libelli "περὶ ψυχᾶς κόσμῳ καὶ φύσις" inscripti, qui vulgo Timaeo Locro tribuitur. Pars I. Fasc. I, gr. 8, vii, 176 S. Erfurt, *Villaret*. n. 6.

Anzeiger, philologischer. Als Ergänzg. d. Philologus, hrsg. v. Ernst v. Leutsch. 13 Bd. 2 Suppl.-Hft. gr. 8, S. 777-904. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* (a) n. 2.40.

Appel (Ernst). De genere neutro intereunte in lingua latina. gr. 8, 121 S. Erlangen, *Deichert*. n. 2.40.

Archiv f. lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik m. Einschluss d. älteren Mittellateins. Als Vorarbeit zu e. Thesaurus linguae latinae m. Unterstützg. der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften hrsg. v. Prof. Ed. Wölfflin. 1 Jahrg. 1 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 160 S. Leipzig, 1884, *Teubner*. n. 12.

Aristophanis comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis graecis instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Pars. V. Pax. gr. 8, xvi, 330 S. Halle, *Buchh. d. Waisenhause*. n. 6. (I-V, n. 31.)

Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae rec. Adph. v. Velsen. gr. 8, viii, 96 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 2.40.

Bednarz (Geo.) De Boethii universo orationis colore. Diss. gr. 8, 32 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. baar n. 1.

Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Hrsg. v. M. Schanz. 2 Bd. 1 Hft. [Der ganzen Reihe 4 Hft.] gr. 8. Würzburg, 1884, *Stuber's Verl.* n. 3. (I u. II, 1, n. 8.) Inhalt: Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. Von Studienlehr. Dr. Phpp. Weber. 1 Abth.: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa. vii, 138 S.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Dr. Adb. Bezenberger. Suppl.-Bd. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Peppmüller*. Subscr.-Pr. n. 10; Einzelpr. n. 12. Inhalt: Die homerische Odyssee, in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt v. Aug. Fick. 330 S.

Bergk (Th.) Griechische Literaturgeschichte. 2 Bd., aus dem Nachlass hrsg. v. Gust. Hinrichs. gr. 8, xi, 544 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. n. 6. (1 u. 2, n. 15.)

— Kleine philologische Schriften. Hrsg. v. Rud. Peppmüller. (In 2 Bdn.) 1 Bd. Zur röm. Literatur. Mit Bergk's (Stahlst.-)Bildniss. gr. 8, xxxii, 718 S. Halle, 1884, *Buchh. d. Waisenhause*. n. 10.

Bezold (C.) Keilschrift-Typen der akademischen Buchdruckerei v. F. Straub in München. hoch 4, 8 S. Leipzig, 1884, *O. Schulze in Comm.* n. 2.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 4 Bd. 3 u. 4 Lfg. hoch 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* baar à n. 24. (I, 1-4; II, IV, 1-4, n. 156.) Inhalt: Alphabetisches Verzeichniss der assyrischen u. akkadischen Wörter im 2 Bde. der "Cuneiform inscriptions of Western Asia," sowie mehrerer anderer meist unveröffentlichter Inschriften. Mit zahlreichen Ergänzn. u. Verbessergn. der Texte nach den Thontafeln d. Brit. Museums v. J. N. Strassmaier, S. J. 3 u. 4 Lfg., S. 385-768.

— 5 Bd. hoch 4. n. 24. Inhalt: Keilschrifttexte Sargon's, Königs v. Assyrien [722-705 v. Chr.] Nach den Originalen neu hrsg., umschrieben, übers. u. erklärt v. Prof. Dr. D. G. Lyon. xvi, 93 S.

Birt (Thdr.) De participiis quae dicuntur perfecti passivi. gr. 4, 24 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* n. —80.

Boltz (Aug.) Die hellenischen Taufnamen der Gegenwart, soweit dieselben antiken Ursprungs sind, nach Gebrauch u. Bedeutung. gr. 8, 48 S. Leipzig, *Friedrich.* n. 1.20.

Brugsch (Heinr.) Thesaurus inscriptionum aegyptiacarum. 2 Abth. Kalendarische Inschriften altägypt. Denkmäler. hoch 4, viii, u. S. 195-530. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* baar n.n. 84. (I u. 2, n.n. 134.)

Buecheler (Franc.) Umbrica, interpretatus est F. B. gr. 8, vi, 223 S. Bonn. *Cohen & Sohn.* n. 7.

Buchholz (E.) Die homerischen Realien. 2 Bd.: Öffentliches u. privates Leben. 2 Abth. Mit 1 lith. Taf. gr. 8, xii, 332 S. Leipzig, *Engelmann.* 5. (I u. II, 23.)

Cauer (Paul). Delectus inscriptionum graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium, iterum composuit P. C. gr. 8, xvi, 365 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* n. 7.

Christ (Osc.) De ablativo Sallustiano. Diss. gr. 8, 101 S. Jena, *Deistung.* baar n. 1.60.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. II, pars 1. gr. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* n. 14. Inhalt: Alexandri in Aristotelem Analyticorum priorum librum I commentarium, ed. Max Wallies. xxii, 426 S.

Corpus inscriptionum atticarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. II, pars 2. Imp.-4. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* cart. n. 54. (I-IV, 1, n. 213.) Inhalt: Inscriptiones atticae aetatis quae est inter Euclidis annum et Augusti tempora, ed. Ulr. Koehler. Pars 2, tabulas magistratum, catalogos nominum, instrumeta juris privati continens. viii, 540 S.

Cruindmeli sive Fulcharii ars metrica. Beitrag zur Geschichte der karoling. Gelehrsamkeit. Zum erstenmal hrsg. v. Dr. Joh. Huemer. gr. 8, viii, 52 S. Wien, *Hölder.* n. 1.80.

Crusius (Otto). Analecta critica ad paroemiographos graecos. gr. 8, 176 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* n. 4.

Dierks (Herm.) De tragicorum histrionum habitu scaenico apud Graecos. gr. 8, 51 S. Göttingen, *Akadem. Buchh.* n. 1.20.

Dittenberger (Wilh.) Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum. 2 fasc. gr. 8, viii, 805 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* n. 16.

Du Cange. Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, conditum a Du C. Ed. nova aucta pluribus verbis aliorum scriptorum a Leop. Favre. Tom. I, A-Bar. 4, lxxv, 576 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 16.

Eclogae poetarum graecorum, scholarum in usum composuit Hugo Stadtmüller. 8, xxiv, 434 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. 2.70.

Egger (Jos.) Katharsis-Studien. Lex.-8, 40 S. Wien, *Hölder in Comm.* n. 1.80.

Fabri (Timotheus). De Mithrae dei solis invicti apud Romanos cultu. Diss. gr. 8, 120 S. Elberfeldae. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. baar n. 2.40.

Firdusii liber regum, qui inscribitur Schahname. Ed. Joa. Aug. Vullers et Sam. Landauer. Tomi III, fasc. 2 et 3. gr. 8, S. 1023-1542. Leiden, 1881 et 83, *Brill*. à n.n. 5. (I-III, 3, n.n. 50.35.)

Fischer (B.) Talmudische Chrestomathie. gr. 8, vii, 268 S. Leipzig, 1884, *Barth*. n. 6.

Flemming (J.) Die grosse Steinplatteninschrift Nebukadnezars II in transcribiertem babylonischen Grundtext, nebst Übersetzg. u. Commentar. Diss. gr. 8, viii, 61 S. Göttingen. Leipzig, *Fock*. baar n. 1.50.

Fränkel (Arth.) Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker. Lex.-8, viii, 471 S. Breslau, *Kern's Verl.* n. 12. X

Gellii (A.) Noctium atticarum libri XX ex recensione et cum apparatu critico Mart. Herz. Vol. I. gr. 8, viii, 447 S. Berlin, *Hertz*. n. 10.

Gemoll (Wilh.) Untersuchungen üb. die Quellen, den Verfasser u. die Abfassungszeit der Geoponica. gr. 8, viii, 280 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 8.

Gilbert (O.) Geschichte u. Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum. I Abtlg. gr. 8, iii, 368 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 6.

Glaser (K.) Üb. Bāṇa's Pārvatīpariṇāyanātaka. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 92 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1.40.

Gomperz (Th.) Herodoteische Studien. II. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 88 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1.40. (I u. II, n. 2.)

Grein (Chrn. W. M.) Kleines angelsächsisches Wörterbuch. Bearb. v. Fr. Groschopp. gr. 8, iv, 238 S. Kassel, *Wigand*. n. 5.

Hitopadescha, der. Altindische Märchen u. Sprüche. Aus dem Sanskrit übers. v. J. Schoenberg. 8, xxvii, 223 S. Wien, 1884, *Konegen*. n. 2.40; geb. n. 3.20.

Hitze (Emil). De Sexto Pompeio. Diss. gr. 8, 34 S. Breslau, *Koebner*. baar n. 1.

Hoffmann (Eman.) Studien auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Syntax. gr. 8, iv, 134 S. Wien, 1884, *Konegen*. n. 3.60.

Hommel (Fritz). Die semitischen Völker u. Sprachen. I Bd. Allgemeine Einleitg. I Buch: Die vorsemit. Kulturen in Aegypten u. Babylonien. Mit 2 Karten ausser u. I in dem Text. 3 Hft. gr. 8, xii u. S. 425-541. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. n. 2. (I Bd. cplt., n. 11.)

Hubrich (Thdr.) De diis Plautinis Terentianisque. Diss. gr. 8, 134 S. Königsberg, *Beyer*. baar n. 1.60.

Jahresbericht üb. die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, hrsg. v. Prof. Conr. Bursian. 10 Jahrg. 1882. Neue Folge. 2 Jahrg. [Mit den Beiblättern: Bibliotheca philologica classica. 10 Jahrg. (1883) u. Biograph. Jahrbuch f. Alterthumskunde. 6 Jahrg. (1883).] 30 bis 33 Bd. 12 Hfte. gr. 8, 32 Bd. I Hft. 96 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 36.

Jahresbericht, u. s. w. Begründet v. Conr. Bursian, hrsg. v. Prof. Iwan Müller. 11 Jahrg., 1883. (Mit denselben Beiblättern.) 34 bis 37 Bd. 12 Hfte. gr. 8, 36 Bd. 1 Hft. 96 S. Ebd. n. 36.

Joest (Wilh.) Das Holontalo. Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Sprachen v. Celebes. gr. 8, viii, 158 S. Berlin, *Asher & Co.* baar n. 6.

Jordan (H.) Marsyas auf dem Forum in Rom. Mit 3 (lith.) Taf. gr. 8, 30 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* n. 1.60.

Körting (Gust.) Encyklopädie u. Methodologie der romanischen Philologie, m. besond. Berücksicht. d. Französischen u. Italienischen. 4 Thl. [1 Buch: Erörterung der Vorbegriffe. 2 Buch: Einleitung in das Studium der roman. Philologie.] gr. 8, xvi, 244 S. Heilbronn, 1884, *Henninger.* n. 4.

Kuhn (Ernst). Über Herkunft u. Sprache der transgangetischen Völker. gr. 4, 22 S. München, *Frans.* n.n. —60.

Kuhnert (Ernst). De cura statuarum apud Graecos. [Aus "Berliner Studien f. class. Philol. u. Archaeol."] gr. 8, 72 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* n. 2.50.

Lambeck (H.) Psalm CIV im Urtext m. seiner Uebertragung in elf Sprachen als Specimen e. Psalter-Polyglotte. gr. 4, iv, 72 S. Köthen, *Schettler's Verl.* n. 3.

Lange (Ludw.) De sacrosanctae potestatis tribuniciae natura eiusque origine commentatio. gr. 4, 43 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Sort.* baar n. 1.60.

Lemm (Osc. v.) Aegyptische Lesestücke zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen u. zum Privatstudium m. Schrifttafel u. Glossar. I Thl. Schrifttafel u. Lesestücke. 2 Hft. gr. 4, vii u. S. 65–128. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* (2) n. 8.

Lincke (Arth. Alex.) Skizze der altägyptischen Literatur m. besond. Berücksicht. der Culturgeschichte. gr. 8, iv, 92 S. Leipzig, *R. Lincke.* n. 3.

Luebbert (Ed.) Diatriba in Pindari locum de Aegidis et sacris Carneis. gr. 4, 18 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn.* n. 1.

— Prolegomena in Pindari carmen Pythium nonum. gr. 4, 22 S. Ebd. n. 1.

— Prolusio in Pindari locum de ludis Pythiis Sicyoniis. gr. 4, 22 S. Ebd. n. 1.

Meyer (E. H.) Indogermanische Mythen. I. Gandharven-Kentauren. gr. 8, ii, 243 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* n. 4.50.

Müller (Frdr.) Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. 3 Bd. Die Sprachen der lockenhaarigen Rassen. 1 Abth. Die Sprachen der Nuba- u. Dravida-Rasse. gr. 8, ix, 246 S. Wien, *Hölder.* n. 5. (I–III, 1, n. 32.)

Müller (Herm. Frdr.) Dispositionen zu den drei ersten Enneaden d. Plotinos. gr. 8, iii, 102 S. Bremen, *Heinsius.* n. 2.

Mueller (Lucian). Quintus Ennius. Eine Einleitg. in das Studium der röm. Poesie. gr. 8, ix, 313 S. St. Petersburg, 1884, *Ricker.* n. 8.

Ovidii Nasonis (P.) Carmina, edd. H. St. Sedlmayer, A. Zingerle, O. Güthling. Vol. II: Metamorphoseon libri XV. Scholarum in usum ed. Ant. Zingerle. 8, xxx, 334 S. Leipzig, 1884, *Freytag.* n. 1.25.

— Fasti. Scholarum in usum ed. Otto Güthling. 8, xxiv, 141 S. Leipzig, *Freytag,* 1884. n. —75.

Papyrus Berolinensem No. 163 musei aegyptiaci commentario critico adiecto ed. Hugo Landwehr. Adiectae sunt tabulae duae. gr. 8, 36 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* n. 1.20.

Peipers (Dav.) *Ontologia Platonica ad notionum terminorumque historiam symbola.* gr. 8, xiv, 606 S. Leipzig, *Teubner in Comm.* n. 14.

Penka (K.) *Origines ariacae.* gr. 8, ix, 214 S. Teschen, *Prochaska.* n. 7.

Petschenig (Dr. Mich.) *Üb. die textkritischen Grundlagen im 2 Theile v. Cassians Conlationes.* [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 31 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n.n. —50.

Pfizmaier (A.) *Untersuchungen üb. Ainu-Gegenstände.* [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 82 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 1.20.

— *Nachrichten aus der Geschichte des nördlichen Thsi.* (Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Imp.-4, 96 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* n. 4.80.

Plato's ausgewählte Dialoge. Erklärt v. Gymn.-Dir. C. Schmelzer. 2 Bd. *Georgias.* gr. 8, 183 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 1.80. (1-5, 6.20.)

— 6 Bd. *Menon. Eutyphron.* gr. 8, 111 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 1.20. (1-6, 7.40.)

Plauti (T. Macci). *Comoediae.* Rec., instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritscheli, sociis operae adsumptis Gust. Loewe, Geo. Goetz, Frdr. Schoell. Tomi II, fasc. 4. *Stichus.* Ed. II a Geo. Goetz recognita. gr. 8, xvi, 110 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* n. 3.60.

Plautus (T. Maccius). *Ausgewählte Komödien.* Erklärt v. Aug. O. Fr. Lorenz. 2 Bdchn.: *Mostellaria.* 2 umgearb. Aufl. gr. 8, 239 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* 2.40.

Ribbeck (Otto). *Kolax.* Eine etholog. Studie. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 114 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* n. 4.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften v. F. Bechtel, A. Bezenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, G. Hinrichs, R. Meister, hrsg. v. Dr. Herm. Collitz. 2 Hft. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Peppmüller.* n. 2, (1 u. 2, n. 4.50.) Inhalt: Die aeolischen Inschriften v. Dr. Fritz Bechtel. [Anh.: Die Gedichte der Balbilla v. Dr. Herm. Collitz.] Die thessalischen Inschriften v. Prof. Dr. Aug. Fick. S. 81-143.

Schliemann (Heinr.) *Troja.* Ergebnisse meiner neuesten Ausgrabgn. auf der Baustelle v. Troja, in den Heldengräbern, Bunärbaschi u. andern Orten der Troas im J. 1882. Mit Vorrede v. Prof. A. H. Sayce. Mit 150 Abbildgn. in Holzschn. u. 4 Karten u. Plänen in Lith. gr. 8, xlv, 462 S. Leipzig, *Brockhaus,* 1884. n. 30; geb. n. 32.50.

Schneidewin (Max). *Homerisches Vocabularium, sachlich geordnet.* gr. 8, viii, 111 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* n. 1.35.

Schrammen (Dr. J.) *Üb. die Bedeutung der Formen d. Verbum.* gr. 8, 143 S. Heiligenstadt, *Delion,* 1884. n. 2.

Stangl (Thom.) *Der sog. Gronovscholiast zu 11 ciceronianischen Reden.* Ueberlieferung, Text u. Sprache, auf Grund e. Neuvergleichg. der Leydener Handschrift dargestellt. gr. 8, v, 82 S. Prag, *Tempisky,* 1884. Leipzig, *Freytag.* n. 2.40.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. G. Curtius, L. Lange, O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius. 6 Bd. 2 Hft. gr. 8, v u. S. 193-331. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* n. 3.40. (6 Bd. cplt., n. 7.90.)

Sturmhoefel (N.) *Neulatein als Weltsprache.* Ein Vorschlag. gr. 8, 24 S. Berlin, *Walther & Apolant,* 1884. n. —50.



Tacitus, Historien. 1 u. 2 Buch. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Ign. Prammer. gr. 8, x, 119 S. Wien, *Hölder*. n. 1.20.

Traube (Ludw.) *Varia libamenta critica*. gr. 8, 39 S. München, *Buchholz & Werner*. n. 1.

Vives (Joh. Ludw.) *Satellitium animi*. Neu hrsg. v. Dr. Jac. Wychgram. 12, vi, 51 S. Wien, *Pichler's Wwe. & Sohn*. n. —60; m. latein. Einleitg. v, 51 S. n. —60.

Voigt (Paul). *Sorani Ephesii liber de etymologiis corporis humani quatenus restitui possit*. Diss. gr. 8, 49 S. Gryphiswaldiae, 1882. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. bear n. 1.

Washietl (Joa. Andr.) *De similitudinibus imaginibusque Ovidianis*. gr. 8, vi, 193 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. n. 6.

Wattenbach (Wilh.) *Scripturae graecae specimina in usum scholarum collegit et explicavit W. W. Libri cui inscriptum erat: Schrifttafeln zur Geschichte der griechischen Schrift ed. II. Fol., 17 S. m. 20 photolith. Taf. Berlin, *Grote*. In Mappe. n. 16.*

Wiedemann (Alfr.) *Sammlung altägyptischer Wörter, welche v. klassischen Autoren umschrieben od. übersetzt worden sind*. gr. 8, 46 S. Leipzig, *Barth*. n. 5.

Windisch (Ernst). *Zwölf Hymnen d. Rigveda m. Sāyana's Commentar, Text. Wörterbuch zu Sāyana. Appendices*. gr. 8, iv, 172 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. n. 5.

Wlastoff (Georges). *Prométhée, Pandore et la légende des siècles. Édition de l'auteur*. Lex.-8, iv, 242 S. St.-Petersbourg. Leipzig, *Teubner*. n. 6.

Wüstenfeld (F.) *Die Çufiten in Süd-Arabien im XI [XVII] Jahrh. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen."]* gr. 4, 148 S. m. 3 Tab. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* n. 6.

#### ITALIAN.

Hoffmann (Gi.) *Grammatica mancese, compendiata dall' opera cinese Zin-Ven-Ki-Mung. Parte I. Firenze, 1883. 8vo, 37 pp. 2m.*

Pepe (L.) *Notizie storiche ed archeologiche dell' antica Gnathia. Ostuni, 1883. 8vo, 180 pp. 3m. 60.*

Salvioni (C.) *Fonetica del dialetto moderno della città di Milano. Torino, 1883. 16mo, 305 pp. 6m.*

#### SPANISH.

Astarloa (P. P.) *Discursos filosóficos sobre la lengua primitiva, ó gramática y análisis razonada de la euskara ó bascuence. Bilbao, 1883. 4to, viii, 784 pp. 20m.*

Campion (A.) *Ensayo acerca de las leyes fonéticas de la lengua euskara. San Sebastian, 1883. 4to, 68 pp. 4m. 80.*

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie u. Grammatik. Als Vorarbeit zu einem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Herausg. v. Ed. Wölfflin. 1ster Jahrg. Heft 1. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1884.

Brugmann (K.) Zur Frage nach den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen der Indogermanischen Sprache. Separatabdruck aus der Internationalen Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. Leipzig, *Barth*, 1883.

Bornemann. Boileau im Urtheile seiner Zeitgenossen. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 5m.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum edita curantibus Joanne Kvičala et Carolo Schenkl. M. T. Ciceronis Orationes Selectae, ed. H. Nohl. Vol. I. Oratio pro Roscio Amerino. Lips. 1884.

Babrii Fabulae, rec. Michael Gitlbauer. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1882. 4m. 80.

Chronicon Parium. Recensuit et praefatus est Joannes Flach. Tübingen. *E. Fues*, 1884. 2m. 40.

Cynewulf's Elene, mit einem Glossar. Herausg. v. Julius Zupitza. 2te Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1883. 1m. 60pf.

Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts in Neudrucken herausg. v. B. Seuffert. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884.

— 16. De la littérature allemande. Von Friedrich dem Grossen. 60pf.

— 17. A. W. Schlegel's Vorlesungen üb. schöne Litteratur u. Kunst. Erster Theil (1801–2), Die Kunstlehre. 3m. 50.

Dunbar (Henry). A complete concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1883.

Engelbrecht. Studia Terentiana. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. 3m.

— De Scoliorum Poesi. *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. 3m.

Franke (F.) Die praktische Spracherlernung. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884. 60pf.

Fränkel (D.) Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker. Breslau, *J. U. Kern's Verlag (Max Müller)*, 1883. 12m.

Garnier (Robert). Les Tragédies. Bd. IV (Schluss). Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 2m. 60.

Güegüence, The. A comedy-ballet in the Nahuatal Spanish dialect of Nicaragua. Edited by D. G. Brinton. Philadelphia, *D. G. Brinton*, 1883.

Hallowell (J. K.) Gunnison, Colorado's Bonanza County. Denver, Col. 1883. 50c.

Hofmann. The Question of a division of the Philosophical Faculty. Inaugural address, etc. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1883. 25c.

Kielmann (H. A.) Der ἀπτος ἐπιώσιος in der Brodbitte des Herrn. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung. Kreuznach, 1883.

Körting (G.) Encyclopaedie u. Methodologie der romanischer Philologie. Erster Theil. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1884. 4m.

Larison (C. W.) Silvia Dubois, now 116 years old. A biography. Ringos, N. J., *C. W. L.*, 1883.

Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry. II. Caedmon's Exodus and Daniel. Edited from Grein. By Theodore W. Hunt, Ph. D. Boston, *Ginn, Heath & Co.*, 1883.

Lummert (Aug.) Die Orthographie der 1sten folioausg. der Shakspeare'schen Dramen. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883. 1m. 6opf.

Margoliouth (D. S.) Studia Scenica. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1883.

Mittheilungen des deutschen Archaeologischen Institutes in Athen. Achter Jahrg. Drittes Heft. Athen, 1883.

Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI u. XVII Jahrh. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883.

— 41. Das Enderinger Judenspiel. Zum 1sten Male herausg. v. Karl v. Arnim. 6opf.

— 42, 43. Elf Fastnachtspiele aus dem Jahr. 1550 u. 1551, v. Hans Sachs. Herausg. v. Edmund Goetze. 1m. 20.

— 44, 45. Gedichte des Königsberger Dichterkreises. Herausg. v. L. H. Fischer. 1ste Hälfte. 6opf.

— 49. Streitgedichte gegen Herzog Friedrich den jüngeren v. Braunschweig. Herausg. v. Friedrich Koldewey. 6opf.

Ovidii (P.) Nasonis, Libellus de Medicamine Faciei, ed., Ovidio vindicavit A. Kunz. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. 2m. 80.

Papageorgius (P. N.) Beiträge zur Erklärung u. Kritik des Sophokles, Pars Prima. Diss. Jena, *Frommann*, 1883.

Reimann (Max). Die Sprache der mittelkentischen Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Englischen Grammatik. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1883. 3m.

Rhaetoromanische Texte. II. Bifrun's Uebersetzung des Neuen Treatments. Herausg. v. Jakob Ulrich. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883. 4m.

Schumann (Wilhelm). Vokalismus u. Consonantismus des Cambriger Psalters. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 2m. 40.

S. Editha sive Chronicon Vilodunense, herausg. v. C. Horstmann. Heilbronn. *Gebr. Henninger*, 1883. 4m.

Sophocles, the Plays and Fragments, with critical Notes, Commentary and Translation in English Prose. By R. C. Jebb. Part I. Oedipus Tyrannus. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1883.

Straschun (D. O.) Der Tractat Taanit des Babylonischen Talmud. Zum 1sten Male ins Deutsche übertragen. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883. 6m.

Techmer (F.) Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. 1ster Bd. 1stes Heft. Leipzig, *J. A. Barth*, 1884.

Washietl (Jo. A.) De similitudinibus imaginibusque Ovidii. Diss. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*. 6m.

Webster (G. H.) A presentation of the grammar of New English, beginning with the age of Elizabeth. Pittsburgh, Penn., *Herald Printing Office*, 1883.

Weil (Henri). Les Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène. Première Série. Leptine—Midias—Ambassade—Couronne. Paris, *Hachette et Cie*, 1883.

Wessely, *Prolegomena ad papyrorum Graecorum novam collectionem edendam*. Vienna, *Carl Gerold's Sohn*, 1883. 3m.

Wulfstan. Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebene Homilien, nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit, herausg. v. Arthur Napier. Erste Abtheilung. Text u. Varianten. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 7m.

Zorzi (Bertolome), *Der Troubadour*. Herausg. v. Emil Levy. Halle, *Max Niemeyer*, 1883. 2m. 40.

BRIEF MENTION.—The first number of the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* has appeared. It is a beautiful volume, sumptuous beyond the dreams of philologists of an earlier day, and is embellished with an engraving of the statue of Wilhelm von Humboldt.

The editor is Dr. F. TECHMER of the University of Leipzig. The contributors are A. F. POTT (Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, 1–68); F. TECHMER (Naturwissenschaftliche Analyse u. Synthese der hörbaren Sprache, 69–170, profusely illustrated; Transkription mittels der lateinischen Kursivschrift, 171–92); G. MALLERY (Sign Language, 193–210); FRIEDRICH MÜLLER (Sind die Lautgesetze Naturgesetze? 211–14); MAX MÜLLER (Zephyros u. Gāhusha, 215–17); L. ADAM (De la catégorie du genre, 218–20); A. H. SAYCE (The person-endings of the Indo-European verb, 222–5); KARL BRUGMAN (Zur Frage nach den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen der Idg. Sprachen, 226–56).

A detailed account of some of the more important articles may be expected in the next number of this Journal. Meantime it must suffice to call attention to this new enterprise, with its princely outset.—(Leipzig, F. A. Barth, 1884.)

In 1881, M. HENRI WEIL gave us a second edition of his *Harangues de Demosthène*. This has been followed by a second edition of the *Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène. Première série: Leptine—Midias—Ambassade—Couronne*. The critical work of this eminent scholar needs no characterisation. The commentary ought to be studied by editors as a pattern. Clear, compact, sensible, free from wearisome grammatical notes, and illustrations that do not illustrate, marked by rare command of the literature, and an equally rare generosity in acknowledging obligation, modelled, in short, by the hand of a master who does not need to call the attention of the reader from the text to admire the commentator. Here and there grammatical knots are cut too sharply, but after all it is delightful to have a Demosthenes in which we are not insulted by a long discussion of everyday constructions.—(Paris, Hachette et Cie.)

The first volume of Professor JEBB's long-expected Sophokles has appeared. It contains the *Oedipus Tyrannus* with an English prose translation facing the Greek text. Professor Jebb's delicate touch in all matters of style gives his work in Greek poetry an especial charm. The metres are presented according to J. H. H. Schmidt, with ample acknowledgment of the service rendered by Professor J. W. White, of Harvard, in making Schmidt's system accessible to the English reading public. It may be added here, as a matter of history, that as far back as 1872, six years before White's translation of Schmidt's *Leitfaden* appeared, Schmidt's system was employed and his schemes given in the Latin grammar of the editor of this Journal. Professor Jebb also gives copious extracts from Mr. Norman's enthusiastic book on the Harvard Greek play, and

this cordial recognition of the work that has been done for Sophokles on our side of the water will increase, if anything could, the warmth of welcome with which this edition of the Oedipus will be received by American scholars. A more detailed notice may be expected. Allusion has been made to the service rendered by Professor WHITE's translation of Schmidt. A new service, which will be appreciated by a still larger circle of scholars, is to be recognized in the editing of Hofmann's *Question of a Division of the Philosophical Faculty*, that memorable paper, which has done more to put the study of the classics, as an educational organon, on its true basis than any treatise of modern times. If the unthinking clamor that has been raised against the study of the classics has had the effect of bringing into fresh notice and introducing to wider circles this unanswerable argument of the Berlin faculty, it is well.—(Boston, Ginn, Heath & Co., 1883.)

The new edition of CAUER's *Delectus Inscriptionum Graecarum propter dialectum memorabilium* is twice as bulky as the first, containing, as it does, 470 numbers and 354 pp. Cauer's *Delectus* in its original form was found to be an important aid in the study of Greek dialects, and the increased material of the second edition will heighten its usefulness. For beginners, fewer inscriptions and more notes would have been desirable, and, indeed, the book postulates a teacher and seems to be intended as a syllabus for lectures rather than as a handbook for private study. For purpose of investigation one must have even more material, but for purposes of illustration and ready reference it will be welcome to all.—(Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1883.)

*Babrii Fabulae.* Recensuit MICHAEL GITLBAUER. Vienna, Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1882. This is the edition of Babrius that Rutherford treated with such needless severity in his own edition. It is not necessary to reproduce Rutherford's strictures, especially as an examination of the Rutherford text will show that the merciless critic has followed Gitlbauer too often to make his onslaught on the Viennese scholar becoming. It will not do to say that a man knows no Greek because he does not know as much about certain points of Greek as, for instance, Mr. Rutherford, whose introduction to Phrynichos has been well received by German scholars, in spite of its rhetoric. To be sure, Mr. Rutherford concedes to Gitlbauer 'native acuteness,' and that is some consolation, a consolation that cannot be accorded to many people, as the world is constituted. Gitlbauer's edition has no exegesis; Rutherford disdains to go at length into grammatical and lexical questions in his notes, unless it suits him, and there is much useful work yet to be done in Babrius for the history of constructions. By the way, it is sometimes hard for a man, who has not attained to Rutherford's knowledge, to appreciate his difficulties. So, for instance, he confesses that he is completely at a loss as to XXIII 5 *δυστυχῶς δ' ἐπαρᾶται | καὶ βοῖν προσάξειν εἰ φύγοι γε τὸν κλέπτην*. 'In what sense can *ἐπαρᾶται* with a future infinitive be used?' he asks. The answer seems to be given by Eur. I. A. 57 sqq.: *καὶ νυν εἰσῆλθεν τάδε | . . . μνηστῆρας . . . σπινθᾶς καθεῖναι καὶ παράσασθαι τάδε, | ὅτου γυνὴ γένοιτο Τυνδαρίς κόρη, | τούτῳ συναμνεῖν . . . καπιστρατεῖσιν καὶ κατασκάψειν*.

X *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker*, von ARTHUR FRÄNKEL. Of this elaborate work we can only sum up the chief results. The author declines to accept the theory which explains the coincidences of the various historians of Alex-

ander by the assumption of a common collective work on which all the historians drew for their information. According to FRÄNKEL, Curtius, Diodoros and Justin go back to Kleitarchos, not Kleitarchos pure and simple, but Kleitarchos more or less corrupted. Diodoros' Kleitarchos was not much spoiled by additions or misunderstandings, but the source of Diodoros was still further troubled by bad materials before it reached Trogus, and before it got to Curtius a number of little changes were made and large additions put in from good quarters, especially from Aristobulos. Arrian used chiefly Ptolemaios and Aristobulos, the latter more than the former. Besides these authors, Arrian made use of Eratosthenes, Nearchos, Megasthenes, Kleitarchos and Hieronymus, besides other historians. Plutarch, in his life of Alexander, consulted a large number of authors in the original. His principal sources are Kleitarchos, Aristobulus, Chares, Onesikritos, the letters of Alexander, the Ephemerides and Hermippos.

The coincidences between Curtius, Diodoros and Justin, on the one hand, and Arrian, on the other, are never perfect, there are always discrepancies, and the differences from Arrian are common to Curtius and Diodoros. This shows that Kleitarchos, the great source of Curtius and Diodoros, used the same authorities as Aristobulos, the great source of Arrian, and that the modifications are due to Kleitarchos and Aristobulos themselves. Another result which Dr. Fränkel has reached is the point to which Kallisthenes continued his work, which is fixed at 328. As to the credit of the various authors, the honesty of Curtius is vindicated against Kaerst. Arrian is honest in the use of his materials, and Diodoros' credit, already good, is not shaken. Trogus (Justin) is also an honorable man, and Plutarch, considering the multiplicity of his sources, which he worked over in his own way, has not been guilty of many derelictions.—(Breslau, J. M. Kern's Verlag, Max Müller, 1883.)

---

#### ERRATA VOL. IV.

p. 57, line 10 from bottom, for *ἡμιν* read *ἡμων*.

p. 88, line 20 from bottom, read 'So in Homer *εἶπέ τε μῦθον* = Attic *τάδ' εἶπεν*.'

p. 91, line 8 from top. This statement of Sturm's should not have passed unchallenged: *πρὸ τοῦ* occurs, instead of *πρὶν* occurs earlier. Comp. Thuk. 3, 68, 1: *πρὸ τοῦ περιτειχίζεσθαι* with 3, 64, 1: *πρὶν περιτειχίζεσθαι*.

p. 220, line 4 from bottom, for *trahe* read *trahere*.

p. 305, line 15 from top, for 'Phileus' read 'Philebus.'

p. 316, note, for "No. 35" read "No. 25."

A few misplaced accents have been noted. On page 373, line 8 from bottom, for *ἀγλαον* read *ἀγλαόν*; but American Hellenists will readily correct such errors for themselves.



## INDEX VOL. IV.

'Abd al ghāni's second journey from Damascus to Jerusalem,	111	Bernays, Bücheler on,	359
Abulwalid's Hebrew-Arabic dictionary,	112	Bifrun's Translation of the New Testa- ment,	498-9
Accent, Greek, Comparative study of,	21-62	BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE, Historical and critical remarks, introductory to a comparative study of Greek accent,	20-62
<i>Ad plenum</i> ,	495	Notice of Bühler's Elementarcursus des Sanskrit,	350-1
Adristas, 'Ἀρπιστής, 'weaver,'	237	Bodmer's Gedichte,	515
Aeschylus, Sept. 10-13,	240	Karl von Burgund,	513
Final sentence in,	433-5	Boethius, Alliterating version of the metres of,	364-8
Alcaeus, Fr. 5,	358	Borrowed word, Tests of a,	68
ALEXANDER, W. J., Participial periphra- ses in Attic prose,	291-308	BROWN, FRANCIS, Review of Schrader's Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testa- ment. Mit einem Beitrag von Dr. Paul Haupt,	338-43
Anglia,	362-9	Bucolic caesura,	75
Antipater Tyrius,	356	Bühler's Leitfaden für den Elementar- cursus des Sanskrit (rev.),	350-1
Aorist and imperfect in Pindar,	158-65	Building-contract of Delos,	108
Aorist participle in periphrasis,	305	Byron's Manfred,	364
Apollonii regis Tyrii historia,	232	Caesar, B. C. 1, 22, 5,	355
Appian 3, 57; 4, 58; 4, 94; 5, 92; 5, 101,	116	3, 109, 5,	240
Aristophanes, Acharnenses 2, 25, 994-9,	121	Caesura, Bucolic,	75
502-7,	361	Cantor on the history of mathematics,	235
Equites 230-4,	121	Carpenter's Grundriss der neuisländischen Grammatik,	104
Nubes 50, 541, 583, 712,	121	Cato, Distichs of,	231
1138,	122	Catullus 64, 64,	355
417,	117	Cauer's Delectus,	530
Vespae 16, 98, 554,	121	Celsus, Writings of,	357
Aves 492, 525,	353	Chalybes as inventors of the use of iron,	353
Final sentence in,	439	Choriclus, Achilles and Polyxena,	110
Aristotle de anima, Wallace's ed. of,	352	Chryseis, Episode of, in Homer,	108
Article, Repetition and omission of, 254-7,	265	Chariton 7, 5, 11,	355
Articular infinitive, Weiske on the,	241	Chaucer, Canterbury Tales, Prologue 459-60,	367
Assonances in Girart de Rossillon,	212	House of Fame and Pope's Temple of Fame,	368
Athens, Harbors of,	193-203	Mother of God,	367
Attic death-list,	373	Cicero, Tusc. I, Sources of,	360
Augustan festivals,	374	pro Archia, ed. Thomas (rev.),	228
Azkara,	112	De leg. 2, 5, 11,	355
Babrianae, Coniecturae,	210-11	Cobet on the MSS of Herodotus,	122
Babrius, Rutherford's,	86-9	on Julian,	124
Gitlbauer's,	530	Color in the Rig Veda,	166-91
75, 6,	355	Color system of Vergil,	1-20
Bale's Comedy concernynge The Lawes (1588),	363		
Barnfield's sonnets,	504-5		
Beddoes, T. L., A survival in style,	445-55		
Behrens' Unorganische Lautvertretung innerhalb der formalen Entwicklung des Französischen Verbalstammes,	214		
Benloew, On Indo-European accent,	34 foll.		
Beowulf, List of Irregular Verbs in,	462		
Berliner Studien,	390		



- MORRIS, G. S., Notice of Wallace's *Aristotle de Anima*, 352
- Müller's (K.) Assonanzen im *Girart von Rossillon*, 212
- Mnemosyne, Report of, 116-24
- Munychia, 197
- NETTLESHIP, HENRY, On the Bucolic caesura, 75
- The *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius, 395-415
- Neumagen, Discoveries at, 358
- Niebelungenlied, Words for color in the, 183 foll.
- Nuptias* into *nozze*, how, 516
- Oratio obliqua* opt. in Hom., 419
- Ornit-Wolfdietrichsage, 104
- Palmyrene inscriptions, 510
- Parataxis and hypotaxis, 419
- Participial periphrases in Attic prose, 291-308
- Participle as an adjective, 293 foll.
- Perfect participles in periphrasis, 307
- Peiraeus, 200
- Petronius, 224, 80, 119
- at the Hanoverian court, 1702, 359
- Phaleron, 192
- Philip V and the Larissaeans, 371
- Pindaric syntax, Studies in, 158-65
- Plato:
- Charmid. 174 E, 354
- Gorgias 521 E, 239
- 500 C, 501 A, 503 C, 513 B, D, E, 435
- Meno 89 A, 434
- Parmen. 135 D, 160 D, 164 A, 234
- Phaedo 62 A, 117
- Phaedrus, Date of, 236
- ν ἐφελευστικόν* in, 234
- Plautus, Mercator, emended by Ribbeck, 501-2
- 524, 460
- Plural of joint address, 372
- Plutarch, Cim. 13, 119
- Lysan. 2, 119
- Polyaenus 1, 1, 2, 355
- Pompeii, Harbor of, 362
- Position of words in oldest French, 216
- POSTGATE, J. P., Etymological studies, 63-70
- Postgate's *Propertius*, 208
- Present participles in periphrasis, 293 foll.
- PRICE, T. R., Color system of Vergil, 1-20
- Prioress's oath, 366
- Prometheus myth, Greek origin of, 239
- Propertius* 3 (4), 7, 47-50, 208-10
- 5, 11, 72, 356
- Prudentius *Cathemerinon* 2, 12, 237
- Quaker *thee* for *thou*, 285-9
- Quintil. 1, 1, 24, 230
- RADDATZ, C. F., Report of Germania, 101-7
- Raetoromanische Grammatik, 486-90
- Recent Publications, 125-31, 247-51, 380-9, 519-26
- Reports:
- Anglia, 362-9
- Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18 Jahrh., 512-15
- Englische Studien, Kölbing's, 503-7
- Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, 232-41
- Germania, 101-7
- Hermes, 108-11, 369-74
- Journal Asiatique, 115, 510-12
- Kreolische Studien, 518
- Mnemosyne, 116-24
- Revue de Philologie, 230-2
- Rheinisches Museum, 353-62
- Romania, 515-17
- Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 111-14, 508-10
- Reviews:
- Bühler's *Leitfaden für den Elementar-cursus des Sanskrit*, 350
- Dunbar's *Concordance to Aristophanes*, 496-7
- Engelbrecht, *Studia Terentiana*, 499-500
- Förster's *Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, 99-100
- Förster, *Das altfranzösische Rolandslied*, 501
- Französische Studien*, 212-18
- Garnett's *Beowulf*, 84-6
- Gartner's *Raetoromanische Grammatik*, 486-90
- Guest's *History of English rhythms*, 478-86
- Haupt's *Beitrag zu Schrader's Keilinschriften*, 338-43
- Klapperich's *Bedingungssatz im Altfranzösischer*, 81-4
- Koschwitz's *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem u. Constantinopel*, 501
- Lumbroso's *L'Egitto al tempo dei Greci e dei Romani*, 219-22
- Mather's *Prometheus Bound*, 490-3
- Mühlau und Volck's *Gesenius' Hebräisches u. Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 343-50
- Morris's *Specimens of Early English*, 334-8
- Ribbeck, *Emendationis Plautinae Mercatoris Spicilegium*, 501-2
- Rutherford's *Babrius*, 86-7
- Schlickum's *Wortstellung in Aucasin u. Nicolets*, 79-81
- Schrader's *Keilinschriften*, 338-43
- Sievers' *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, 224-8
- Shuckburgh's *Lysias*, 93-5
- L. Toulmin Smith's *Gorboduc*, 95-7
- Studemund's *Due Commedie parallele di Difilo*, 98-9
- Sturm's *Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit πρίν*, 89-92

- Greek :  
 δὲ changed into ἄν, 354  
 εἰ, Orthotonesis of, 59  
 ἐπαγωγή, ἐπαγωγή, ἐπαναφέρειν, ἐπι-  
 φέρειν, 355  
 ἔως, constructions of, 416 foll.  
 καὶ γάρ τοι, 231  
 ν ἐφέλευστικόν, 234  
 δίομαι, δίω, 69  
 πρίν, 93-5  
 σίραιον, 66  
 φῆς, Orthotonesis of, 60  
 ὡς final, 419  
 Greek flutes, 233  
 Greek accent, Comparative study of, 21-62  
 Guest's History of English rhythms (rev.), 478-86  
 GUMMERE, F. B., On the English dative-  
 nominative of the personal pronoun, 283-90  
 Guthe on the Siloam inscription, 114  
 Hadley on Greek accent, 39, 44 foll.  
 Hagedorn's Gedichte, 513  
 Harbors of Ancient Athens, 192-203  
 HALL, I. H., Review of Frothingham's  
 L'Omelia di Giacomo di Sarug, 222-4  
 HARRIS, J. RENDEL, On Stichometry,  
 133-57, 309-31  
 On a transposition in Seneca, 77  
 HARRISON, J. A., Review of Garnett's  
 Beowulf, 84-6  
 Schuchardt's Kreolische Studien, 518  
 List of strong verbs in Beowulf, 462  
 Havet on the Saturnian verse, 238  
 Herakles as a Scytho-Germanic god, 240  
 Hermes, Report of, 108-11, 369-74  
 Herodotus, Cobet on the MSS of, 124  
 Final sentence in, 441  
 Hesiod, Final sentence in, 430  
 Hofmann's Question of a division of the  
 Philosophical Faculty, 530  
 Homer, Hymn in Mercur. 92, 106, 117,  
 225, 239, 280, 305, 373, 437, 233  
 Final sentence in, 420-30  
 HOPKINS, E. W., Words for color in the  
 Rig Veda, 166-91  
 Horace, Odes 1, 6, 236  
 1, 12, 372  
 2, 2, 356  
 2, 1, 4, 22, 238  
 Vocabula Graecanica in the titles of the  
 Odes of, 239  
 How, how that, 276-7  
 HUMPHREYS, M. W., Report of Revue de  
 Philologie, 230-2  
 Ibn Tibbon's Translation of Saadia, 509  
 Imperfect and aorist in Pindar, 158-65  
 Inorganic change of sound in the French  
 verb, 214  
 Jacob of Edessa, 508-9  
 JAGEMANN, v. H. C. G., Notice of Karls  
 des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem u.  
 Constantinopel, hrsg. v. Koschwitz, 501  
 Das altfranzösische Rolandslied, hrsg.  
 v. Förster, 501  
 Report of Romania, 515-17  
 James of Sarug, 222-4  
 Jebb's Oedipus Tyrannus, 529  
 Journal Asiatique, Report of, 115, 510-12  
 Julian, Cobet on, 124  
 Juv. 3, 14; 6, 542, 237  
 King James' revision of the N. T., Revi-  
 sion of, 253-82  
 Klapperich's Historische Entwicklung  
 der syntaktische Verhältnisse der Be-  
 dingungssätze im Altfranzösischen, 81 foll.  
 Klopstock's Messias, 514  
 Körting u. Koschwitz, Französische Stu-  
 dien (rev.), 79-84, 212-18  
 Koschwitz's Karls des Grossen Reise nach  
 Jerusalem u. Constantinopel, 501  
 Legend of the Jew boy, 102  
 Legende of goode women, 364  
 Lenormant, 371  
 Leucippus and Democritus, 238  
 Liceo, liceor, 63  
 Livy 3, 33, 8, 232  
 5, 21, 355  
 23, 5, 15; 24, 6, 7; 25, 28, 6, 230  
 Long walls of Athens, 202  
 Longinus περὶ ὑψους 4, 41, 120  
 Lucian, Bis acc., 117  
 Demonax, 204  
 Lucretius, Archetypal codex of, 238  
 LUDLOW, THOMAS W., The harbors of  
 Ancient Athens, 192-203  
 Lombroso's L'Egitto al tempo dei Greci  
 e dei Romani, 219-22  
 Lyric poets, Final sentence in, 431  
 Lysias, Shuckburgh's, 93-5  
 Macaulay's History, Thum on, 506-7  
 McCURDY, J. F., Review of Mühlau and  
 Volck's edition of Gesenius' Lexicon,  
 343-50  
 Malum, Martha on, 230  
 Marlowe's Faustus, 363  
 Martial 6, 52, 4, 231  
 Mather's Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound, 490-3  
 Matthew (St.), Revision of, 253-82  
 Messapian inscriptions, 361  
 Meyer's Griechische Grammatik, rev. by  
 Clemm, 232  
 Misteli on Greek accent, 37, 44 foll.  
 Modulabilis, 495  
 MORRIS, C. D., Report of Mnemosyne, 116-24  
 Review of Dunbar's Concordance to the  
 comedies and fragments of Aristopha-  
 nes, 496-7  
 Review of Shuckburgh's Lysias, 93-5

- |  |           |  |                |
|--|-----------|--|----------------|
| WARREN, MINTON, Review of Otto Ribbeck, <i>Emendationum Mercatoris Plautinae Spicilegium</i> , | 501-2     | William of Palerne,  | 905            |
| Review of Studemund's <i>Dus Comedie parallele di Difilo</i> ,                                 | 98-9      | Wölflin's <i>Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik</i> , | 494-6          |
| Review of Thomas's <i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Oratio pro Archia</i> ,                              | 228       | WOOD, H., Review of L. Toulmin Smith's <i>Gorboduc</i> ,             | 95-7           |
| Review of Wölflin's <i>Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie u. Grammatik</i> ,                 | 494-6     | Beddoes, T. L., <i>A survival in style</i> ,                         | 445-55         |
| Weber's <i>Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze</i> ,                                      | 416 foll. | Word accent in Middle English,                                       | 365            |
| Weil's <i>Demosthenes</i> ,  | 529       | Words for color in the <i>Rig Veda</i> ,                             | 166-92         |
| WHEELER, J. H., Report of <i>Rheinisches Museum</i> ,  | 353-62    | Xenophon's <i>Anabasis</i> , Lincke on,                              | 120            |
|  |           | Resp. Lac. 2, 6,   | 231            |
|  |           | de vectigalibus 1, 1; 1, 7; 4,                                       |                |
|  |           | 13; 4, 19; 4,  | 39             |
|  |           | <i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i> ,     | 111-14, 508-10 |











IS NOT CIRCULAI

OCT 17 1978

FOR LIBRARY USE ONLY

